



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

5 T

rd Depository
ittle Book

508.4 copy 2



יהוה



A
GRAMMAR
OF
THE IDIOM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

PREPARED AS A SOLID BASIS FOR THE INTERPRETATION
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY
DR. GEORGE BENEDICT WINER.

SEVENTH EDITION, ENLARGED AND IMPROVED.

BY
DR. GOTTLIEB LÜNEMANN,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GÖTTINGEN.

REVISED AND AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION.



Indober:
WARREN F. DRAPER.
LONDON: TRÜBNER AND CO. LEIPSIC: F. C. W. VOGEL.
PHILADELPHIA: SMITH, ENGLISH, & CO.
1874.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1874, by
WARREN F. DRAPER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

Recd. Nov. 4, 1873.

21 C + 11

ANDOVER:
PRINTED BY WARREN F. DRAPER.

PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION.

WHEN this Grammar first made its appearance, in 1822, the object proposed was to oppose the unbridled license with which the diction of the New Testament was then, and had long been, handled in commentaries and exegetical lectures; and to apply, as far as practicable, the results of an enlightened philology, as deduced and taught by Hermann and his school, to the study of the language of the New Testament. It was high time that some voice should be raised against the inveterate empiricism of expositors, and that some effort should be made to emancipate the writers of the N. T. from the bondage of a perverted philology, which styled itself sacred and yet showed not the least respect towards the sacred authors and their well-considered phraseology.

The fundamental error — the *πρώτου ψεύδος* — of the Biblical philology and exegesis to which we refer, consisted ultimately in this, that neither the Hebrew nor the language of the N. T. was regarded as a living idiom (Herm. Eurip. Med. p. 401.), designed to be used by men as the medium of intercourse. Had scholars deliberately inquired, whether those departures from the current laws of speech which were assumed to exist in the Bible in such prodigious multitudes, were compatible with the essential principles of a language intended for the ordinary purposes of life, they would not so arbitrarily have held every kind of anomaly to be permissible; and would not have delighted to attribute to the Apostles in almost every verse an enallage or a substitution of the wrong construction for the right.

The older commentaries belonging to the period of the Reformation are comparatively free from such perversions; but when

we read certain commentaries of the 18th and 19th centuries still current, we are constrained to conclude that the main characteristic of the language of the N. T. is a total want of precision and regularity. For these interpreters are continually showing how here a wrong tense is used, there a wrong case, here a comparative for a positive, there *ó* for *τὺς*, but instead of *for*, consequently for *because*, on the other side for *on this side* (what for so Isa. viii. 20). Such exegetical learning makes a reader quite impatient with the sacred writers for their ignorance of the ordinary principles of language. He cannot comprehend how such men in oral discourse, where this lawlessness of speech must certainly have been still more conspicuous, could have made themselves understood even, much less how they could have won over to Christianity a great number of persons of education.

But this system of explaining every difficulty by a *pro* or an *idem quod* had a serious as well as a ludicrous aspect. For does not Scripture become, as an eminent linguist long ago intimated, like a waxen nose, which every one can twist as he pleases, in proportion to his ignorance of the learned tongues? Would it have been impossible, or even difficult, for such a man as Storr, for example, had the task been assigned him, to have found in the words of the Apostles any favorite notion whatever? And does such a view of N. T. diction accord with the dignity of sacred writers? ¹ Every one who now-a-days should insist on using in the ordinary intercourse of life such perversions of language as the following: *I shall come to thee to-day* for *I came to thee to-day*; *no prophet ever came out of Galilee* for *no prophet will ever come out of Galilee* (Jno. vii. 52); *I call you no longer servants* for *I did not call you mere servants* (Jno. xv. 15); *for Jesus himself testified, that a prophet has no honor in his own country* for *although Jesus himself testified*, etc. (Jno. iv. 44); *I saw the forest that was magnificently covered with foliage* for *a forest that was*, etc. (Jno. v. 1²); *send me the book, and I will read it*, for *thou wilt*

¹ *Herm.* ad Viger. p. 786: Diligenter caveant tirones, ne putent, viros spiritu sancto afflatos sprevisse sermonem mortalium, sed meminerint potius, illam interpretandi rationem, qua nonnulli theologorum utuntur, nihil esse nisi blasphemiam.

² To what extent expositors of the old school were devoid of all sense of expression may be seen (instar omnium) in Kühn's reasoning, Mt. p. 120 sq.

send me the book, etc.; to whom it was revealed that for to whom this was revealed, yet so that, etc. (1 Pet. i. 12¹); *Christ is dead therefore risen again for but risen again; he is not more learned for he is not learned; he rejoiced that he should see, etc., and he saw and rejoiced, for he would have rejoiced if he had seen, etc., he rejoiced even at what he already saw* (Jno. viii. 56); *he began to wash for he washed* (Jno. xiii. 56), and the like,—would be regarded as having lost his reason. Were all the instances of a *quid pro quo* which many expositors during the decennaries just past have put into the mouth of the Apostles to be collected, the list could not fail to be astounding.

When, at the commencement of my career as a university tutor, I undertook to combat this absurd system of interpretation, I was aware that there were scholars far more competent for the task than myself; and, in fact, what I accomplished in the earlier editions of this book was but imperfect. My attempt, however, was cordially encouraged by distinguished men, and in particular by Vater and D. Schulz. Others pointed out, sometimes indeed in a spirit of bitterness, the imperfections of the work; and to these unsparing critics I have been greatly indebted, not only in this publication, but in all my exegetical labors. By discussions annexed to the second edition (1828) the grammatical contents of the work were enlarged, and the third edition came out greatly improved, both in copiousness and accuracy, by a more extensive study of the writings of the Greek prose authors and of the Hellenistic Jews. From that time forward I have labored incessantly to improve the work; and I have been animated by the aid which philological and exegetical publications suited to my purpose have furnished me in rich abundance. At the same time, the intelligent investigation of the N. T. diction has been daily gaining ground; and the use of the Grammar by commentators has been growing more and more evident. The work began to attract the attention of professed philologists even. At the same time I have always been far from thinking the correct grammatical elucidation of the N. T. to be its only proper exposition; and I have, in silence, allowed some to regard me even as an opponent of what is now called the theological interpretation.

¹ On this passage see my Erlanger Pfingstprogr. 1830. 4to.

The present edition — the sixth — will show again on every page, that I have spared no effort to arrive at truth. Deeply, however, do I regret, that in the midst of my labors I was overtaken by a nervous affection of the eyes, which has brought me to the verge of total blindness. This calamity has compelled me to employ the eyes and hands of others to complete this edition. I cannot omit this opportunity of expressing publicly my sincere thanks to all the young friends whose indefatigable assistance only has enabled me, in spite of my frequent forebodings, to accomplish my task.

The change in the arrangement of the matter in Part III. will, I trust, be approved. In other respects, it has been my especial aim to treat every point with greater completeness, and in smaller space, than in previous editions; (the text of the Grammar now occupies *eight sheets* fewer than before). With this view I adopted all possible abbreviations in the Biblical and Greek citations.¹ It is hoped, however, that these, as well as those for the names of more recent authors,² will everywhere be intelligible. The citations have been verified anew throughout; and, so far as I know, not a single work that has appeared since 1844 has been left unused, or at least unnoticed.

The text of the N. T. I have uniformly, that is except when there was a question of various readings, quoted in accordance with the second Leipsic edition of Dr. Tischendorf, which at present has probably the most extensive circulation.

May this new revision — the last the work will ever receive from me — contribute to the diffusion of Biblical truth, so far as any such work can.

¹ The Greek writers are only quoted by the page when the division by chapters has not obtained currency: Plato, according to the edition by *Stephan.*; Strabo and Athenæus, by *Casaubon*; Demosthen. and Isocrat., by *H. Wolf*; Dionys. Hal., by *Reiske*; Dio Cass., by *Reimar.*; Dio Chrysost., by *Merell.*

² It may be remarked here, that instead of *Kuinoel* (the Latinized form of the name), *Kühnöl*, as the family wrote their name in German, is used everywhere, except in Latin citations.

PREFACE TO THE SEVENTH EDITION.

WINER's foreboding that the sixth edition would be the last revision from his hand has unfortunately been realized. But even while sensible of his approaching death, the indefatigable man took incessant interest in his Grammar, and labored to the very end of his life to perfect it. Without altering the general distribution of matter as it appeared in the sixth edition, he constantly improved the book in details,—by additions of greater or less extent in more than three hundred and forty places, by erasures and reconstructions, by the multiplication of parallel passages from biblical and from profane literature, by a more precise definition of thoughts and expressions, by the correction of trivial oversights and mistakes, etc. etc. Thus he has not left us without bequeathing to us in this book a legacy richer than ever.

When the publisher confided to me the preparation of the new edition which had become necessary, I could not hesitate a moment what course to adopt. It was clear to me, in the first place, that the book must retain absolutely and throughout the character of a work by Winer. This was demanded, on the one hand, by reverence towards the departed author; whom no one has hitherto surpassed—whom hardly any one among those now living will surpass—in a department which he cultivated with especial fondness for more than a generation. It appeared also, on the other hand, to be a sacred duty towards the theological public, to whom Winer's work, on account of its scholarly exactness and copious erudition, justly became long ago a precious possession and a universally acknowledged authority. I considered myself, therefore, as bound to abstain from every radical

alteration of the text, either as respects the general arrangement or as respects the development of details. My task, rather, I perceived to be merely this: while preserving in its integrity the character of Winer's book, to increase as far as possible, in the spirit and intent of Winer, its usefulness for students of the present day. I have taken especial pains to work into the text the numerous manuscript notes from Winer's hand. In doing this, Winer's own words have been retained as far as it was any way feasible; and changes, when necessary, have always been restricted so closely, that they affect merely what is unessential, never the matter itself. Further, I have made it a point, not merely to correct silently the obvious oversights and mistakes I met with—and they proved to be more numerous than I expected—and to give to the cross-references a definiteness in which they were often deficient, but also to consult, as far as pertinent, the theological and philological works which have appeared since Winer's death, and to use in this new edition what they contained worthy of attention. Whenever, too, a question of textual criticism is involved, regard has been paid to the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus. Yet great self-restraint has been imposed throughout, in order not to augment excessively a work already of considerable bulk.

Winer's additions and alterations have been directly incorporated with the text without being indicated by a particular sign. They will be plain to every one who will take the pains to compare the seventh edition with the sixth. On the other hand, the additions which I have made have been in all cases marked by square brackets. The square brackets already used by Winer here and there, have consequently been made to give place to other signs; such as round brackets, dashes, etc. In conclusion it may be remarked that very great care has been taken to secure typographical accuracy.

And now may the book, in this its seventh edition, subserve its purpose to afford the interpretation of the New Testament a stable foundation.

DR. LÜNEMANN.

AMERICAN EDITOR'S PREFACE.

WINER'S Grammar is now for the fourth time rendered accessible to English readers. A translation of the first edition was made by the late Professors Stuart and Robinson, and published at Andover in 1825. The fourth edition of the original, rendered into English by Professors Agnew and Ebbeke, appeared in 1839. Twenty years later Professor Masson's translation of the sixth German edition was published at Edinburgh (and Philadelphia). The present work was originally announced (in April 1866) as a revision of Professor Masson's. The labor of revision was drawing towards completion, and nearly three hundred pages of the book had been stereotyped, when appeared the seventh German edition, under the supervision of Dr. Lünemann. Some unavoidable delay ensued before the revision and the printing were begun anew in conformity with this new edition. These facts explain why the publication of the present volume follows the original announcement so tardily.

The book still remains, substantially, a revision of Professor Masson's translation. The changes introduced have been such as could be made upon the printed sheets of that work. This circumstance has frequently affected their form and sometimes their number. But although Professor Masson's version has been retained as the basis of this, it is believed that hardly a paragraph of his work remains altogether unaltered; and sometimes the alterations amount in effect to a new translation,—a translation which for entire pages has but a few phrases in common with its predecessor.

In making the changes described it has been the editor's aim to render the version a faithful reproduction of the original. A faithful translation, he believes, should not only be free from

intentional addition,¹ omission, or alteration, but in a work of this kind should adhere as closely to the author's expression as English idiom will permit. Accordingly, should the renderings seem, here and there, to have lost a little in ease, a compensation will be found, it is hoped, in their increased accuracy.

It has not been judged necessary to annotate any interpretation having a doctrinal bearing, even though such interpretation be debatable on grammatical grounds, or to qualify an expression or two respecting the sacred writers which may strike many English readers as unwarrantably free; for the book is likely to be used either by students with mature understandings in exercise, or by pupils under the guidance of competent teachers. The reasons which have led the editor to disregard the request that he would abridge and otherwise alter the original work will be suggested by Professor Lünemann's remarks upon this point.

The notation of the sections, etc., has been carefully retained throughout. When it could be done conveniently, the cross-references have been rendered more definite by subjoining the number of the page. To aid those who may use this book in connection with Commentaries which refer to the Grammar by pages, the paging of the sixth and seventh German editions, as well as of Professor Masson's translation, has been noted on the outer margin of the leaves. The indexes have been revised, and that of Greek words has been considerably enlarged. Further, the Index of Passages in the New Testament has been made complete, and the references themselves have been carefully verified; this laborious work has been performed by Mr. G. W. Warren, formerly a student in this Seminary, at present Professor of Biblical Interpretation in the Baptist Theological Seminary at Chicago, Illinois. This Index, it is believed, will be highly valued by students. A glance at it will show with how little exaggeration the book may be called a grammatical commentary on the more difficult texts of the New Testament. Other references the editor has been content simply to transfer to the pages of the translation. This will account for their frequent want of uniformity.

Pains have been taken to give the work that typographical

¹ In a single passage it seemed necessary to append a note; see page 598.

accuracy which is a leading requisite in a satisfactory manual. On this point, however, the editor would not speak too confidently; for even in the seventh German edition, which is as superior to the sixth in accuracy of typography as it is in elegance, errata have been discovered by the score. It is hoped that the mistakes which have slipped in, will not exceed in number those detected, and silently rectified, in the German original.

In conclusion, the editor would express the desire that the book in its present form may both facilitate and increase that patient, reverent study of the letter of the Inspired Word, which is indispensable to the fullest reception of it as spirit and life.

J. HENRY THAYER.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ANDOVER, MASS.
October, 1868.

NOTE.

IN this new impression the Biblical references, both in the body of the work and as collected in the N. T. Index, have been verified again. A few of the former, which appear to be wrong as they stand but which the editor had not the means of correcting, have been marked with [?]. The alterations in the N. T. Index are so numerous, that it has been found convenient occasionally to sink an added reference into a foot-note; and, in inserting other references to the pages, to disregard sometimes the strict numerical order. In some instances, also, the gap left by the removal of erroneous references has not been closed up. The re-examination of this index proves it to be not quite "complete"; but there are no omissions, it is believed, which a student will regret.

J. H. T.

ANDOVER, September, 1873.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
On the Scope, Treatment, and History of N. T. Grammar, §§ 1-4,	1

PART FIRST.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION ESPECIALLY IN ITS GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS.

§ 1. Various Opinions concerning the Character of the N. T. Diction,	12
§ 2. Basis of the N. T. Diction,	20
§ 3. Hebrew-Aramaic Tinge of the N. T. Diction,	27
§ 4. Grammatical Character of the N. T. Diction,	35

PART SECOND.

THE GRAMMATICAL FORMS AS RESPECTS THEIR FORMA- TION (INFLECTION).

§ 5. Orthography and Orthographic Principles,	40
§ 6. Accentuation,	49
§ 7. Punctuation,	55
§ 8. Rare Forms of the First and Second Declensions,	60
§ 9. Rare Forms of the Third Declension,	64
§ 10. Foreign Words and Words which are Indeclinable,	66
§ 11. Inflection and Comparison of Adjectives,	68
§ 12. Augment and Reduplication of Regular Verbs,	70
§ 13. Rare Forms in the Tenses and Persons of Regular Verbs,	73
§ 14. Rare Inflections of Verbs in MI and of Irregular Verbs,	78
§ 15. Defective Verbs,	81
§ 16. Formation of Words,	91

PART THIRD.

SYNTAX.

A. IMPORT AND USE OF THE SEVERAL PARTS OF SPEECH.

CHAPTER I. THE ARTICLE.

	PAGE
§ 17. The Article as a Pronoun, ...	104
§ 18. Articulus Praepositivus, a. before Nouns, ...	105
§ 19. Omission of the Article before Nouns, ...	119
§ 20. Articulus Praepositivus, b. with Attributives, ...	131

CHAPTER II. PRONOUNS.

§ 21. The Pronouns in general, ...	140
§ 22. Personal and Possessive Pronouns, ...	143
§ 23. The Demonstrative Pronoun, ...	157
§ 24. The Relative Pronoun, ...	163
§ 25. The Interrogative Pronoun and the Indefinite Pronoun <i>TI</i> , ...	168
§ 26. Hebraisms in connection with certain Pronouns, ...	171

CHAPTER III. THE NOUN.

§ 27. Number and Gender of Nouns, ...	174
§ 28. The Cases in general, ...	179
§ 29. Nominative and Vocative, ...	181
§ 30. Genitive, ...	184
§ 31. Dative, ...	208
§ 32. Accusative, ...	221
§ 33. Connection of a Verb (neuter) with its dependent Noun by means of Prepositions, ...	232
§ 34. Adjectives, ...	234
§ 35. Comparative, ...	239
§ 36. Superlative, ...	245
§ 37. Numerals, ...	245

CHAPTER IV. THE VERB.

§ 38. Active and Middle Voices, ...	251
§ 39. The Passive, ...	260
§ 40. The Tenses, ...	264

CONTENTS.

xvii

	PAGE
§ 41. The Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative Moods, ...	281
§ 42. The Conjunction 'AN with the three Moods, ...	302
§ 43. The Imperative, ...	310
§ 44. The Infinitive, ...	317
§ 45. The Participle, ...	340

CHAPTER V. THE PARTICLES.

§ 46. The Particles in general, ...	356
§ 47. The Prepositions in general, and such as govern the Genitive in particular, ...	358
§ 48. Prepositions with the Dative, ...	384
§ 49. Prepositions with the Accusative, ...	396
§ 50. Interchange, Accumulation, and Repetition of Prepositions, ...	409
§ 51. Use of Prepositions in Circumlocutions, ...	423
§ 52. Construction of Verbs compounded with Prepositions, ...	425
§ 53. Conjunctions, ...	433
§ 54. Adverbs, ...	462
§ 55. Negative Particles, ...	473
§ 56. Construction of Negative Particles, ...	500
§ 57. Interrogative Particles, ...	508

B. STRUCTURE OF PROPOSITIONS, AND THEIR COMBINATION INTO PERIODS.

§ 58. The Proposition and its Component Parts in general, ...	512
§ 59. Extension of a Simple Sentence in its Subject and Predicate: Attributives, Apposition, ...	523
§ 60. Connection of Sentences: Periods, ...	537
§ 61. Position of Words and Clauses, especially when Irregular (Hyperbaton), ...	546
§ 62. Interrupted Structure of Sentences; Parentheses, ...	561
§ 63. Broken and Heterogeneous Structure of Sentences; Anacoluthon, Oratio variata, ...	566
§ 64. Defective Structure of Sentences; Ellipsis, Aposiopesis, ...	580
§ 65. Redundant Structure of Sentences; Pleonasm (Superfluity), Diffuseness, ...	601

	PAGE
§ 66. Condensed and Expanded Structure of Sentences (Breviloquence, Constructio Praegnans, Attraction, etc.), ...	619
§ 67. Abnormal Relation of Individual Words in a Sentence (Hypallage), .	631
§ 68. Regard to Sound in the Structure of Sentences; Paronomasia and Play upon Words (Annominatio), Parallelism, Verse, ...	636

INDEX.

I. Index of Principal Subjects, ...	643
II. Index of Greek Words and Forms, ...	652
III. Index of Passages in the N. T. explained or cited, ...	668

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE SCOPE, TREATMENT, AND HISTORY OF N. T. GRAMMAR.

§ 1. THE language of the N. T., like every other, presents two aspects for scientific consideration, inasmuch as the words which we find in the N. T. following one another in connected discourse may be considered either by themselves, in reference to their origin and their meaning (the *material* element); or as respects their legitimate employment in the structure of clauses and periods (the *formal* element). The former is the business of Lexicography; the latter belongs to Grammar, which must be carefully distinguished from N. T. *Stylistics* (Rhetoric).

On distinguishing Lexicography from Grammar, see Pott in the Kieler Allgem. Monatsschr. 1851. Juli. The Lexicography of the N. T., of which Synonymy forms a very important part, though its importance was not duly recognized till of late, has always been cultivated in a merely practical manner. A *theory* of it, however, may be laid down; which might be styled *Lexicology*, — a term that has recently come into use. That this theory has not as yet been fully developed and perfected is the less surprising, since even the classic tongues remain destitute of a Lexicology; and in the department of Exegetical Theology a theory of Biblical Criticism (higher and lower) is still a desideratum. This deficiency, however, has had a decidedly unfavorable effect on practical lexicography, as might be easily shown by a close examination of the lexicographical works on the N. T. which have hitherto appeared, even the most recent not excepted.¹

N. T. *Stylistics* or Rhetoric (the latter appellation has already been employed by Glassius and by Bauer, author of *Rhetorica Paulina*), should exhibit the characteristics of N. T. style in its freedom and individuality,

¹ For some remarks on the theory of lexicography, see *Schleiermacher*, *Hermeneutik*, S. 49. 84. A commencement towards a comparative lexicography has been made by *Zeller*, in his *theolog. Jahrb.* II. 443 ff.

- 14 restricted only by the character and aim of the composition ; and this it should do both generally, and in reference to the peculiarities of the *genera dicendi* and of the respective writers (cf. Hand, *Lehrb. d. lat. Styls.* p. 25 sq.). In this department much remains to be done, (particularly as respects the theory of rhetorical figures, erroneous views respecting which have at all times caused much mischief in the interpretation of the N. T.).
- 2 The preparatory labors of Bauer and Dan. Schulze,¹ however, are of service ;
 7th ed. and Wilke has made a compilation (*N. T. Rhetorik*, Dresd. 1843. 8vo.)
 2
 6th ed. worthy of attention. Schleiermacher had already given excellent hints in his *Hermeneutik*. As respects the discourses of Jesus and the apostolic epistles, it would be best to follow the example of the ancient rhetoricians, and treat in Biblical Rhetoric of the style of reasoning. This would prevent the excessive subdivision of N. T. Exegetics, and the separation of kindred subjects, which, when treated in connection, afford mutual light. Cf., besides, Gersdorf, *Beiträge zur Sprachcharakterist. d. N. T.* 1 Bd. S. 7 ; Keil, *Lehrb. der Hermeneutik*, S. 28 ; C. J. Kellman, *Diss. de usu Rhetorices hermeneutico*. Gryph. 1766. 4to.

It may be incidentally remarked, that in their exposition of Exegetical Theology our *Encyclopaedias* still leave much to be desired. And in practice, too, N. T. Hermeneutics is not properly distinguished from N. T. Philology,² as we may call that entire department of Exegetical Theology which has just been sketched.

- § 2. A grammatical exposition of the idiom of the N. T., in so far as it is a variety of the Greek language, would strictly considered involve only a systematic comparison of that idiom with the grammatical structure of the later Greek literary language ; for with this last the idiom of the N. T. is closely connected, both chronologically and generically. As, however, this later Greek itself has not yet been delineated in its peculiarities as a whole, and as the idiom of the N. T. also exhibits throughout the influence of a *foreign* tongue (the Hebrew-Aramaic) upon the Greek, N. T.
- 15 Grammar must be so far extended as to comprise a scientific

¹ *K. Lud. Bauer*, *Rhetorica Paullina*. Halle, 1782. 3 pts. in 2 Vol. 8vo. ; also *Philologia Thucydideo-Paullina*. Halle, 1773. 8vo. (To these may be added : *H. G. Tzschirner*, *observationes Pauli Ap. epistolar. scriptoris ingenium concernentes*. Viteb. 1800. 3 Partes. 4to.) *J. Dan. Schulze*, *der schriftstellerische Werth und Charakter des Johannes. Weissenf.* 1803. 8vo. ; also, *der schriftsteller. Werth und Char. des Petrus, Judas und Jacobus.* eb. 1802. 8vo. ; also, *über den schriftst. Char. und Werth des Evang. Markus*, in *Keil and Tzschirner's Analekt.* 2 Bds. 2 St. S. 104-151. 3 St. S. 69-132. 3 Bds. 1 St. S. 88-127.

² I should prefer this old and intelligible appellation, "*Philologia sacra N. T.*" (cf. *J. Ch. Beck*, *conspect. system. philol. sacrae*. Bas. 1760. 12 Section. 4to.) to that which *Schleiermacher*, following classic usage, proposes, "*Grammar*"; see *Lücke*, on his *Hermeneutik*, S. 10.

exposition of the mode in which the Jewish authors of the N. T. wrote the Greek of their time.

If it were proposed e.g. to write a grammar of the Egyptian or Alexandrian variety of the Greek (as this variety had been moulded there in the mouths of Greek-speaking residents from various parts of the world), it would be enough to collect all its distinctive peculiarities, that is to say, all that make it a separate dialect; not indeed simply stringing them together in a fragmentary way, but arranging them systematically under the several divisions of grammar, and pointing out how and to what extent they respectively modified the general laws of the Greek language (by abandoning niceties, misusing analogies, etc.). The idiom of the N. T., as it is a variety of the later Greek, should it require a grammar of its own, could only be exhibited as a species of a species; and thus a grammar of the N. T. would presuppose a grammar of the later Greek. But N. T. Grammar cannot easily be so restricted even in thought, still less can the idea be carried out to advantage. For, on the one hand, the Grammar of later Greek, especially in its oral popular form, has not yet been scientifically investigated;¹ consequently, the groundwork for N. T. Grammar exists in thought rather than in fact. On the other hand, the idiom of the N. T. displays also the influence of a non-cognate language, the Hebrew-Aramaic, upon the Greek. N. T. Grammar, therefore, must extend its limits in two directions: Presuming the reader to be acquainted with the Grammar of classic Greek, it must point out in the manner already described the peculiarities of the later Greek, as exhibited in the N. T.; and likewise show, in the same scientific way, how and to what extent the Greek was modified by Hebrew-Aramaic influence. It would be wrong, however, to attempt to keep the two quite separate,² for the mingling of the (later) Greek with the national (or Jewish) element in the mind of the writers of the N. T., produced a single composite syntax, which must be recognized and exhibited in its essential unity.

¹ Valuable information, though rather lexical than grammatical, will be found in *Lobeck's* notes on Phrynichi Eclog. Lips. 1820. 8vo. Previously *Irmisch* (on Herodian) and *Fischer* (de vitiis Lexicor. N. T.) had collected much useful matter. Copious hints relative to the *graecitas fatiscens* have been more recently presented in the improved texts of the Byzantine writers, and the indices (of very unequal merit) appended to most of them in the Bonn edition; as well as in *Boissonade's* notes in the anecdot. graec. (Paris, 1829 ff. V. 8.), and in his editions of Marinus, Philostratus, Nicetas Eugen., Babrius, etc.; and, lastly, in *Müllach's* ed. of Hierocles (Berl. 1853. 8vo.), [cf. also his *Grammatik der griech. Vulgarsprache in histor. Entwicklung*. Berl. 1856. 8vo.]. To the later Greek element appropriate reference is made likewise in *Lobeck's* *Paralipomena grammaticae Gr.* Lips. 1837. 2 pts. 8vo., in his *Pathologiae sermonis Gr. proleg.* Lips. 1843. 8vo., and pathol. Graeci serm. elementa, Königsb. 1853. I. 8vo., and also in *ῥηματικὸν* s. verbor. Gr. et nominum verball. technologia, ib. 1846. 8vo.

² For judicious remarks on the lexical treatment of Hebraisms, see *Schleiermacher's* *Hermeneutik*, S. 65.

This mode of treating N. T. Grammar will undergo a *partial* change
 16 whenever the grammar of the later Greek language shall have received
 an independent exposition; for then it will not be necessary to *prove* the
 peculiarities of this later language by examples, — a task from which the
 N. T. grammarian cannot for the time be released. But *one* portion of
 the present contents of a grammar will gradually disappear, viz. the
 4 *polemic*, which opposes inveterate and deeply rooted prejudices, or errors
 7th ed. which have again made their appearance. As yet, however, this negative
 vindication of the true character of the diction of the N. T.: still continues
 indispensable; for, well-known expositors even of very recent date (Kühnöl,
 Flatt, Klausen in his *Evangeliencomm.*) have shown us again how deeply
 rooted is that old grammatical empiricism which deems it an abomination
 ultra Fischerum (or even Storrium) sapere.

Special grammars of separate portions of the N. T., as of the writings
 of John, of Paul, are clearly out of the question. The distinctive qualities
 4 that mark the diction of these writers in particular, consist almost entirely
 8th ed. in the use of certain favorite expressions, or relate to the department of
 Rhetoric, as may be seen from the observations of Blackwall in his *Crit.*
Sacr. N. T. II. 2. 8. p. 322 sqq. ed. Lips. To this also peculiarities in
 the collocation of words are mostly to be assigned. Grammar is but
 seldom affected by these peculiarities of individuals. Accordingly Schulze
 and Schulz¹ have, on the whole, formed a more correct estimate of such
 peculiarities of diction than Gersdorf, whose well-known work — no great
 contribution of *sure* results even to verbal criticism — must have almost
 proved its own refutation, if it had had to be continued on the principles
 hitherto laid down.

§ 3. Although investigation into the language of the N. T. is
 the basis of all sound interpretation, yet N. T. Grammar has been
 till a recent period almost entirely excluded by Biblical philologists
 from the range of their inquiries. While the lexical element of
 the N. T. language has been the subject of repeated investigation,
 the grammatical has been treated at the most only so far as it
 stood connected with the discussion of the Hebraisms of the N. T.²

¹ His remarks on the character of the N. T. diction are contained in his dissertation
 on the Parable of the Steward (Bresl. 1821. 8vo.) and that on the Lord's Supper
 (Leipzig, 1824; 2d improved edit. 1831. 8vo.), and also in several articles in the
Wachlersch. theol. Annalen. In both dissertations, which are of an exegetical char-
 acter, his observations, mostly acute, seem out of place, as they throw very little light
 on exegesis. Textual criticism, however, might have turned his views to good account,
 if the distinguished writer had only been pleased to give them to us in full. Cf. also
Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, S. 129.

² An honorable exception among earlier expositors is the nearly forgotten *G. F.*
Heupel, who in his copious and almost purely philological Commentary on the Gospel
 of Mark (Strassburg, 1716. 8vo.) makes many excellent grammatical observations.

Only Casp. Wyss (1650) and G. Pasor (1655) conceived more completely the idea of a N. T. grammar; but their efforts were unavailing to accomplish its recognition as a special department of exegetical discipline. During a period of one hundred and sixty years after them, Haab was the first to publish a special treatise on the Grammar of the N. T.; but his rather uncritical work, besides being restricted to the Hebraisms, was adapted to retard the science, rather than to promote it. 5
7th ed.

The first author who in some degree collected and explained the peculiarities of the N. T. diction, was the celebrated Sal. Glass (†1656) in his *Philologia Sacra*, the third book of which is entitled *Grammatica Sacra*, and the fourth *Grammaticae Sacrae Appendix*.¹ But as he everywhere makes the Hebrew his point of departure, and touches upon the language of the N. T. only so far as it coincides with that, his treatise, to say nothing of its deficiencies, can be mentioned in a history of N. T. Grammar only as a weak performance. It serves to remind us, however, of the two writers mentioned above, whose very names, as well as their productions, which belong here, had fallen into almost total oblivion. The one, Casp. Wyss, Prof. of Greek in the Gymnasium of Zurich (†1659), published *Dialectologia Sacra*, in qua quicquid per universum N. F. contextum in apostolica et voce et phrasi a communi Graecor. lingua eoque grammatica analogia discrepat, methodo congrua disponitur, accurate definitur et omnium sacri contextus exemplorum inductione illustratur. Tigur. 1650. pp. 324 (besides the appendix), small 8vo. In this treatise the grammatical peculiarities of N. T. diction are arranged under the following heads: *Dialectus Attica*, *Ionica*, *Dorica*, *Aeolica*, *Boeotica*, *Poetica*, *Ἑβραϊσμοί*. This arrangement is awkward in the extreme, since kindred topics are separated and frequently are discussed in four different places. The writer's acquaintance with the Greek dialects, also, was clearly not beyond the ordinary scholarship of his time, as the very mention of a special *dialectus poetica* shows, and an examination of what he calls *Attic* renders still more manifest. Still, as a collection of examples, which in several sections is absolutely complete, the volume has value; and as respects the grammatical Hebraisms of the N. T. the author's moderation might well have been imitated by his contemporaries. 5
6th ed.

George Pasor, Prof. of Greek at Franeker (†1637), known by his small *Lexicon of the N. T.*, — which has been several times republished, finally by J. F. Fischer, — left among his papers a grammar of the N. T., which his son, Matthias Pasor, Prof. of Theology at Gröningen (†1658), pub-

The Greek erudition of J. F. Hombergk, in his *Parerga Sacra*. Amstel. 1719. 4to., and of H. Heisen, in his *Novae Hypotheses Interpretandae felicius Ep. Jacobi*. Brem. 1739. 4to., is lexical rather than grammatical.

¹ In Dathe's edition this *Grammatica Sacra* forms, as is well known, the first book.

18 lished, with additions and improvements of his own, under the following title: *G. Pasoris Grammatica Graeca Sacra N. T. in tres libros distributa.*

6 Gröning. 1655. pp. 787. 8vo. This work is now a literary rarity,¹ though
 7th ed. it is far more fitted than the *Lexicon* to transmit the author's name to posterity. It is divided, as the title indicates, into three books. The first contains the Inflections; the second, the Syntax (244–530); the third, seven appendices: *de nominibus N. T., de verbis N. T., de verbis anomalis, de dialectis N. T., de accentibus, de praxi grammaticae, de numeris s. arithmetica graeca.* The second book and the Appendix *de dialectis N. T.*² are the most valuable portions of the work. For in the first book, and in
 6 most of the appendices which form the third, he treats of the ordinary
 8th ed. subjects of a general Greek grammar, superfluously inserting e.g. full paradigms of the Greek nouns and verbs. The syntax is elaborated with great accuracy and copiousness. The writer points out what is Hebraistic, but seldom adduces parallels from native Greek authors. This useful volume, however, is without a full index.

During the interval from Pasor to Haab, the Grammar of the N. T. was treated but incidentally in treatises on the style of the N. T., e.g. by Leusden (*de Dialectis N. T.*) and Olearius (*de Stylo N. T.*, pp. 257–271). But these authors confined themselves almost exclusively to Hebraisms, and by representing as Hebraistic much pure Greek phraseology, they involved in confusion again the whole inquiry concerning the Grammar of the N. T. Georgi was the first to vindicate the Greek character of numerous constructions usually regarded as Hebraistic, although even he did not escape one-sidedness. His writings attracted but little attention; while the works of Vorst and Leusden now obtained through the efforts of Fischer new currency, and Storr's well-known book³ was allowed for many years to exert its pernicious influence on the interpretation of the N. T. without restraint.

From the school of Storr appeared Ph. H. Haab (rector of Schweigern, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, †1833) with his *Hebrew-Greek Grammar of the N. T.*, prefaced by F. G. v. Süsskind. Tübing. 1815. 8vo. Over-looking the pure Greek element in the N. T. diction, he directed his

¹ Even *Foppen* (*Bibliotheca Belgica*, Tom. I. p. 342), who gives a list of Pasor's other writings, does not mention this work. *Salthen*, *Cat. Biblioth. Lib. Rar.* (Regiom. 1751. 8vo.) p. 470, bears witness to its extreme rarity, and *D. Gerdesius*, in his *Florileg. Hist. Crit. Libr. Rar.* (Gröning. 1763. 8vo.) p. 272.

² Pasor had already himself added this appendix, under the title *Idea (syllabus brevis) Graecar. N. T. Dialectorum*, to the first edition of his *Syllabus Graeco-Lat. omnium N. T. vocum.* Amstel. 1632. 12mo. At the end he promises the above full *Grammatica N. T.*

³ *Observatt. ad analog. et syntaxin Hebr.* Stuttg. 1779. 8vo. Some acute grammatical observations, especially on enallage temporum, particularum, and the like, are to be found in *J. G. Straube*, *diss. de emphasi graecae linguae N. T. in v. d. Honert*, p. 70 sqq.

attention merely to grammatical Hebraisms, and in the arrangement of the whole he followed the works of Storr and Weckherlin (Hebr. Gram. 19 2 Pts.). If the reviewer in Bengel's Archiv (1 B. S. 406 ff.) is to be credited, "the author has accomplished his task with such diligence, such sound judgment, such accuracy, and such nice and comprehensive knowledge of language, as must obtain for it the approbation of all friends of the well-grounded interpretation of the N. T." A very different and almost entirely opposite opinion has been expressed, however, by two scholars who must be regarded as most competent and impartial judges in this department: in the n. theol. Annal. 1816. 2 B. S. 859-879, and (by deWette?) in the A. LZ. 1816. N. 39-41. S. 305-326. After long and various use of the book, I am compelled to say that I entirely concur in their decision. The principal fault of the book consists in the author's not having correctly distinguished the classic Greek element from the Hebraistic in the diction of the N. T., and in his having consequently adduced as Hebraistic much either that is common to all cultivated languages, or that occurs as frequently in the classics as in the N. T.; while from his partiality to Storr's views, he has quite misinterpreted numerous passages of the N. T. by forcing Hebraisms upon them (see proof below). Moreover, the book is full of confusion, the matter is arranged most arbitrarily, and the whole begins with a section on Tropes!—a subject not belonging to Grammar at all. The last of the reviewers mentioned above does not, accordingly, seem too severe in concluding his criticism with these words: "Seldom have we met a work which was so complete a failure as this, and against the use of which we must warn the public so emphatically." 7th ed.

§ 4. Further, the detached grammatical remarks in commentaries on the books of the N. T., in miscellanies, and in exegetical monographs, though sometimes exhibiting creditable research, failed to furnish, all taken together, a complete discussion of the Grammar of the N. T. These contributions, moreover, were rendered useless by that uncritical empiricism which controlled Greek Philology till the beginning of the present century, and Hebrew till a much more recent period; just as this same empiricism has imparted to the interpretation of the N. T. the impress of uncertainty and arbitrariness. The philosophical method of handling philological subjects,—that method which seeks in national and individual peculiarities of thought the grounds of all phenomena of speech, anomalies even not excepted,—has effected a complete revolution in the study of Greek; and the application of the same method to the language of the N. T. can alone invest the Grammar of the N. T. with a scientific character, and elevate it to the dignity of a safe guide in interpretation. 20

PART THIRD.

SYNTAX.

A. IMPORT AND USE OF THE SEVERAL PARTS OF SPEECH.

CHAPTER I. THE ARTICLE.

	PAGE
§ 17. The Article as a Pronoun, ...	104
§ 18. Articulus Praepositivus, a. before Nouns, ...	105
§ 19. Omission of the Article before Nouns, ...	119
§ 20. Articulus Praepositivus, b. with Attributives, ...	131

CHAPTER II. PRONOUNS.

§ 21. The Pronouns in general, ...	140
§ 22. Personal and Possessive Pronouns, ...	143
§ 23. The Demonstrative Pronoun, ...	157
§ 24. The Relative Pronoun, ...	163
§ 25. The Interrogative Pronoun and the Indefinite Pronoun <i>TI</i> , ...	168
§ 26. Hebraisms in connection with certain Pronouns, ...	171

CHAPTER III. THE NOUN.

§ 27. Number and Gender of Nouns, ...	174
§ 28. The Cases in general, ...	179
§ 29. Nominative and Vocative, ...	181
§ 30. Genitive, ...	184
§ 31. Dative, ...	208
§ 32. Accusative, ...	221
§ 33. Connection of a Verb (neuter) with its dependent Noun by means of Prepositions, ...	232
§ 34. Adjectives, ...	234
§ 35. Comparative, ...	239
§ 36. Superlative, ...	243
§ 37. Numerals, ...	248

CHAPTER IV. THE VERB.

§ 38. Active and Middle Voices, ...	251
§ 39. The Passive, ...	260
§ 40. The Tenses, ...	264

CONTENTS.

xvii

	PAGE
§ 41. The Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative Moods, ...	281
§ 42. The Conjunction "AN with the three Moods, ...	302
§ 43. The Imperative, ...	310
§ 44. The Infinitive, ...	317
§ 45. The Participle, ...	340

CHAPTER V. THE PARTICLES.

§ 46. The Particles in general, ...	356
§ 47. The Prepositions in general, and such as govern the Genitive in particular, ...	358
§ 48. Prepositions with the Dative, ...	384
§ 49. Prepositions with the Accusative, ...	396
§ 50. Interchange, Accumulation, and Repetition of Prepositions, ...	409
§ 51. Use of Prepositions in Circumlocutions, ...	423
§ 52. Construction of Verbs compounded with Prepositions, ...	425
§ 53. Conjunctions, ...	433
§ 54. Adverbs, ...	462
§ 55. Negative Particles, ...	473
§ 56. Construction of Negative Particles, ...	500
§ 57. Interrogative Particles, ...	508

B. STRUCTURE OF PROPOSITIONS, AND THEIR COMBINATION INTO PERIODS.

§ 58. The Proposition and its Component Parts in general, ...	512
§ 59. Extension of a Simple Sentence in its Subject and Predicate: Attributives, Apposition, ...	523
§ 60. Connection of Sentences: Periods, ...	537
§ 61. Position of Words and Clauses, especially when Irregular (Hyperbaton), ...	546
§ 62. Interrupted Structure of Sentences; Parentheses, ...	561
§ 63. Broken and Heterogeneous Structure of Sentences; Anacoluthon, Oratio variata, ...	566
§ 64. Defective Structure of Sentences; Ellipsis, Aposiopesis, ...	580
§ 65. Redundant Structure of Sentences; Pleonasm (Superfluity), Diffuseness, ...	601

	PAGE
§ 66. Condensed and Expanded Structure of Sentences (Breviloquence, Constructio Praegnans, Attraction, etc.), ...	619
§ 67. Abnormal Relation of Individual Words in a Sentence (Hypallage), .	631
§ 68. Regard to Sound in the Structure of Sentences; Paronomasia and Play upon Words (Annominatio), Parallelism, Verse, ...	636

INDEX.

I. Index of Principal Subjects, ...	643
II. Index of Greek Words and Forms, ...	652
III. Index of Passages in the N. T. explained or cited, ...	668

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE SCOPE, TREATMENT, AND HISTORY OF N. T. GRAMMAR.

§ 1. THE language of the N. T., like every other, presents two aspects for scientific consideration, inasmuch as the words which we find in the N. T. following one another in connected discourse may be considered either by themselves, in reference to their origin and their meaning (the *material* element); or as respects their legitimate employment in the structure of clauses and periods (the *formal* element). The former is the business of Lexicography; the latter belongs to Grammar, which must be carefully distinguished from N. T. *Stylistics* (Rhetoric).

On distinguishing Lexicography from Grammar, see Pott in the *Kieler Allgem. Monatsschr.* 1851. Juli. The Lexicography of the N. T., of which Synonymy forms a very important part, though its importance was not duly recognized till of late, has always been cultivated in a merely practical manner. A *theory* of it, however, may be laid down; which might be styled *Lexicology*,—a term that has recently come into use. That this theory has not as yet been fully developed and perfected is the less surprising, since even the classic tongues remain destitute of a Lexicology; and in the department of Exegetical Theology a theory of Biblical Criticism (higher and lower) is still a desideratum. This deficiency, however, has had a decidedly unfavorable effect on practical lexicography, as might be easily shown by a close examination of the lexicographical works on the N. T. which have hitherto appeared, even the most recent not excepted.¹

N. T. *Stylistics* or Rhetoric (the latter appellation has already been employed by Glassius and by Bauer, author of *Rhetorica Paulina*), should exhibit the characteristics of N. T. style in its freedom and individuality,

¹ For some remarks on the theory of lexicography, see *Schleiermacher*, *Hermeneutik*, S. 49. 84. A commencement towards a comparative lexicography has been made by *Zeller*, in his *theolog. Jahrb.* II. 443 ff.

- 14 restricted only by the character and aim of the composition; and this it should do both generally, and in reference to the peculiarities of the *genera dicendi* and of the respective writers (cf. Hand, *Lehrb. d. lat. Styls.* p. 25 sq.). In this department much remains to be done, (particularly as respects the theory of rhetorical figures, erroneous views respecting which have at all times caused much mischief in the interpretation of the N. T.).
- 2 The preparatory labors of Bauer and Dan. Schulze,¹ however, are of service; and Wilke has made a compilation (N. T. *Rhetorik*, Dresd. 1843. 8vo.)
- 7th ed. 2 worthy of attention. Schleiermacher had already given excellent hints
- 6th ed. in his *Hermeneutik*. As respects the discourses of Jesus and the apostolic epistles, it would be best to follow the example of the ancient rhetoricians, and treat in Biblical Rhetoric of the style of reasoning. This would prevent the excessive subdivision of N. T. Exegetics, and the separation of kindred subjects, which, when treated in connection, afford mutual light. Cf., besides, Gersdorf, *Beiträge zur Sprachcharakterist. d. N. T.* 1 Bd. S. 7; Keil, *Lehrb. der Hermeneutik*, S. 28; C. J. Kellman, *Diss. de usu Rhetorices hermeneutico*. Gryph. 1766. 4to.

It may be incidentally remarked, that in their exposition of Exegetical Theology our Encyclopaedias still leave much to be desired. And in practice, too, N. T. Hermeneutics is not properly distinguished from N. T. Philology,² as we may call that entire department of Exegetical Theology which has just been sketched.

- § 2. A grammatical exposition of the idiom of the N. T., in so far as it is a variety of the Greek language, would strictly considered involve only a systematic comparison of that idiom with the grammatical structure of the later Greek literary language; for with this last the idiom of the N. T. is closely connected, both chronologically and generically. As, however, this later Greek itself has not yet been delineated in its peculiarities as a whole, and as the idiom of the N. T. also exhibits throughout the influence of a *foreign* tongue (the Hebrew-Aramaic) upon the Greek, N. T.
- 15 Grammar must be so far extended as to comprise a scientific

¹ K. Lud. Bauer, *Rhetorica Paullina*. Halle, 1782. 3 pts. in 2 Vol. 8vo.; also *Philologia Thucydideo-Paullina*. Halle, 1773. 8vo. (To these may be added: H. G. Tzschirner, *observationes Pauli Ap. epistolar. scriptoris ingenium concernentes*. Viteb. 1800. 3 Partes. 4to.) J. Dan. Schulze, *der schriftstellerische Werth und Charakter des Johannes. Weissenf.* 1803. 8vo.; also, *der schriftsteller. Werth und Char. des Petrus, Judas und Jacobus*. eb. 1802. 8vo.; also, *über den schriftst. Char. und Werth des Evang. Markus*, in Keil and Tzschirner's *Analekt.* 2 Bds. 2 St. S. 104-151. 3 St. S. 69-132. 3 Bds. 1 St. S. 88-127.

² I should prefer this old and intelligible appellation, "*Philologia sacra N. T.*" (cf. J. Ch. Beck, *consp. system. philol. sacrae*. Bas. 1760. 12 Section. 4to.) to that which Schleiermacher, following classic usage, proposes, "*Grammar*"; see Lücke, on his *Hermeneutik*, S. 10.

exposition of the mode in which the Jewish authors of the N. T. wrote the Greek of their time.

If it were proposed e.g. to write a grammar of the Egyptian or Alexandrian variety of the Greek (as this variety had been moulded there in the mouths of Greek-speaking residents from various parts of the world), it would be enough to collect all its distinctive peculiarities, that is to say, all that make it a separate dialect; not indeed simply stringing them together in a fragmentary way, but arranging them systematically under the several divisions of grammar, and pointing out how and to what extent they respectively modified the general laws of the Greek language (by abandoning niceties, misusing analogies, etc.). The idiom of the N. T., as it is a variety of the later Greek, should it require a grammar of its own, could only be exhibited as a species of a species; and thus a grammar of the N. T. would presuppose a grammar of the later Greek. But N. T. Grammar cannot easily be so restricted even in thought, still less can the idea be carried out to advantage. For, on the one hand, the Grammar of later Greek, especially in its oral popular form, has not yet been scientifically investigated;¹ consequently, the groundwork for N. T. Grammar exists in thought rather than in fact. On the other hand, the idiom of the N. T. displays also the influence of a non-cognate language, the Hebrew-Aramaic, upon the Greek. N. T. Grammar, therefore, must extend its limits in two directions: Presuming the reader to be acquainted with the Grammar of classic Greek, it must point out in the manner already described the peculiarities of the later Greek, as exhibited in the N. T.; and likewise show, in the same scientific way, how and to what extent the Greek was modified by Hebrew-Aramaic influence. It would be wrong, however, to attempt to keep the two quite separate,² for the mingling of the (later) Greek with the national (or Jewish) element in the mind of the writers of the N. T., produced a single composite syntax, which must be recognized and exhibited in its essential unity.

¹ Valuable information, though rather lexical than grammatical, will be found in *Lobeck's* notes on Phrynichi Eclog. Lips. 1820. 8vo. Previously *Irmisch* (on Herodian) and *Fischer* (de vitiiis Lexicor. N. T.) had collected much useful matter. Copious hints relative to the *graecitas fatiscens* have been more recently presented in the improved texts of the Byzantine writers, and the indices (of very unequal merit) appended to most of them in the Bonn edition; as well as in *Boissonade's* notes in the anecdot. graec. (Paris, 1829 ff. V. 8.), and in his editions of Marinus, Philostratus, Nicetas Eugen., Babrius, etc.; and, lastly, in *Müllach's* ed. of Hierocles (Berl. 1853. 8vo.), [cf. also his *Grammatik der griech. Vulgarsprache in histor. Entwicklung*. Berl. 1856. 8vo.]. To the later Greek element appropriate reference is made likewise in *Lobeck's* *Paralipomena grammaticae Gr.* Lips. 1837. 2 pts. 8vo., in his *Pathologiae sermonis Gr. proleg.* Lips. 1843. 8vo., and *pathol. Graeci serm. elementa*, Königsb. 1853. I. 8vo., and also in *σημειωτικὸν τῶν ῥημάτων*. Gr. et nominum verball. technologia, ib. 1846. 8vo.

² For judicious remarks on the lexical treatment of Hebraisms, see *Schleiermacher's Hermeneutik*, S. 65.

This mode of treating N. T. Grammar will undergo a *partial change* 16 whenever the grammar of the later Greek language shall have received an independent exposition; for then it will not be necessary to *prove* the peculiarities of this later language by examples, — a task from which the N. T. grammarian cannot for the time be released. But *one* portion of the present contents of a grammar will gradually disappear, viz. the 4 *polemic*, which opposes inveterate and deeply rooted prejudices, or errors 7th ed. which have again made their appearance. As yet, however, this negative vindication of the true character of the diction of the N. T. still continues indispensable; for, well-known expositors even of very recent date (Kühnöl, Flatt, Klausen in his *Evangeliencomm.*) have shown us again how deeply rooted is that old grammatical empiricism which deems it an abomination *ultra Fischerum* (or even *Storrium*) *sapere*.

Special grammars of separate portions of the N. T., as of the writings of John, of Paul, are clearly out of the question. The distinctive qualities 4 that mark the diction of these writers in particular, consist almost entirely 6th ed. in the use of certain favorite expressions, or relate to the department of Rhetoric, as may be seen from the observations of Blackwall in his *Crit. Sacr. N. T. II. 2. 8. p. 322* sqq. ed. Lips. To this also peculiarities in the collocation of words are mostly to be assigned. Grammar is but seldom affected by these peculiarities of individuals. Accordingly Schulze and Schulz¹ have, on the whole, formed a more correct estimate of such peculiarities of diction than Gersdorf, whose well-known work — no great contribution of *sure* results even to verbal criticism — must have almost proved its own refutation, if it had had to be continued on the principles hitherto laid down.

§ 3. Although investigation into the language of the N. T. is the basis of all sound interpretation, yet N. T. Grammar has been till a recent period almost entirely excluded by Biblical philologists from the range of their inquiries. While the lexical element of the N. T. language has been the subject of repeated investigation, the grammatical has been treated at the most only so far as it stood connected with the discussion of the Hebraisms of the N. T.²

¹ His remarks on the character of the N. T. diction are contained in his dissertation on the Parable of the Steward (Bresl. 1821. 8vo.) and that on the Lord's Supper (Leipzig, 1824; 2d improved edit. 1831. 8vo.), and also in several articles in the *Wachlersch. theol. Annalen*. In both dissertations, which are of an exegetical character, his observations, mostly acute, seem out of place, as they throw very little light on exegesis. Textual criticism, however, might have turned his views to good account, if the distinguished writer had only been pleased to give them to us in full. Cf. also *Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik*, S. 129.

² An honorable exception among earlier expositors is the nearly forgotten *G. F. Heupel*, who in his copious and almost purely philological Commentary on the Gospel of Mark (Strassburg, 1716. 8vo.) makes many excellent grammatical observations.

Only Casp. Wyss (1650) and G. Pasor (1655) conceived more completely the idea of a N. T. grammar; but their efforts were unavailing to accomplish its recognition as a special department of exegetical discipline. During a period of one hundred and sixty years after them, Haab was the first to publish a special treatise on the Grammar of the N. T.; but his rather uncritical work, besides being restricted to the Hebraisms, was adapted to retard the science, rather than to promote it. 5
7th ed.

The first author who in some degree collected and explained the peculiarities of the N. T. diction, was the celebrated Sal. Glass (†1656) in his *Philologia Sacra*, the third book of which is entitled *Grammatica Sacra*, and the fourth *Grammaticae Sacrae Appendix*.¹ But as he everywhere makes the Hebrew his point of departure, and touches upon the language of the N. T. only so far as it coincides with that, his treatise, to say nothing of its deficiencies, can be mentioned in a history of N. T. Grammar only as a weak performance. It serves to remind us, however, of the two writers mentioned above, whose very names, as well as their productions, which belong here, had fallen into almost total oblivion. The one, Casp. Wyss, Prof. of Greek in the Gymnasium of Zurich (†1659), published *Dialectologia Sacra*, in qua quicquid per universum N. F. contextum in apostolica et voce et phrasi a communi Graecor. lingua eoque grammatica analogia discrepat, methodo congrua disponitur, accurate definitur et omnium sacri contextus exemplorum inductione illustratur. Tigur. 1650. pp. 324 (besides the appendix), small 8vo. In this treatise the grammatical peculiarities of N. T. diction are arranged under the following heads: *Dialectus Attica, Ionica, Dorica, Aeolica, Boeotica, Poetica, Ἑβραϊσμοί*. This arrangement is awkward in the extreme, since kindred topics are separated and frequently are discussed in four different places. The writer's acquaintance with the Greek dialects, also, was clearly not beyond the ordinary scholarship of his time, as the very mention of a special *dialectus poetica* shows, and an examination of what he calls *Attic* renders still more manifest. Still, as a collection of examples, which in several sections is absolutely complete, the volume has value; and as respects the grammatical Hebraisms of the N. T. the author's moderation might well have been imitated by his contemporaries. 5
6th ed.

George Pasor, Prof. of Greek at Franeker (†1637), known by his small *Lexicon of the N. T.*, — which has been several times republished, finally by J. F. Fischer, — left among his papers a grammar of the N. T., which his son, Matthias Pasor, Prof. of Theology at Gröningen (†1658), pub-

The Greek erudition of J. F. Hombergk, in his *Parerga Sacra*. Amstel. 1719. 4to., and of H. Heisen, in his *Novae Hypotheses Interpretandae felicius Ep. Jacobi*. Brem. 1739. 4to., is lexical rather than grammatical.

¹ In Dathe's edition this *Grammatica Sacra* forms, as is well known, the first book.

18 lished, with additions and improvements of his own, under the following title: *G. Pasoris Grammatica Graeca Sacra N. T. in tres libros distributa.*

6 Gröning. 1655. pp. 787. 8vo. This work is now a literary rarity,¹ though
 7th ed. it is far more fitted than the *Lexicon* to transmit the author's name to posterity. It is divided, as the title indicates, into three books. The first contains the Inflections; the second, the Syntax (244–530); the third, seven appendices: *de nominibus N. T.*, *de verbis N. T.*, *de verbis anomalis*, *de dialectis N. T.*, *de accentibus*, *de praxi grammaticae*, *de numeris s. arithmetica graeca*. The second book and the Appendix *de dialectis N. T.*² are the most valuable portions of the work. For in the first book, and in
 6 most of the appendices which form the third, he treats of the ordinary
 8th ed. subjects of a general Greek grammar, superfluously inserting e.g. full paradigms of the Greek nouns and verbs. The syntax is elaborated with great accuracy and copiousness. The writer points out what is Hebraistic, but seldom adduces parallels from native Greek authors. This useful volume, however, is without a full index.

During the interval from Pasor to Haab, the Grammar of the N. T. was treated but incidentally in treatises on the style of the N. T., e.g. by Leusden (*de Dialectis N. T.*) and Olearius (*de Stylo N. T.*, pp. 257–271). But these authors confined themselves almost exclusively to Hebraisms, and by representing as Hebraistic much pure Greek phraseology, they involved in confusion again the whole inquiry concerning the Grammar of the N. T. Georgi was the first to vindicate the Greek character of numerous constructions usually regarded as Hebraistic, although even he did not escape one-sidedness. His writings attracted but little attention; while the works of Vorst and Leusden now obtained through the efforts of Fischer new currency, and Storr's well-known book³ was allowed for many years to exert its pernicious influence on the interpretation of the N. T. without restraint.

From the school of Storr appeared Ph. H. Haab (rector of Schweigern, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, †1833) with his *Hebrew-Greek Grammar of the N. T.*, prefaced by F. G. v. Süskind. Tübing. 1815. 8vo. Over-looking the pure Greek element in the N. T. diction, he directed his

¹ Even *Foppen* (*Bibliotheca Belgica*, Tom. I. p. 342), who gives a list of Pasor's other writings, does not mention this work. *Salthen*, *Cat. Biblioth. Lib. Rar. (Regiom. 1751. 8vo.)* p. 470, bears witness to its extreme rarity, and *D. Gerdesius*, in his *Florileg. Hist. Crit. Libr. Rar. (Gröning. 1763. 8vo.)* p. 272.

² Pasor had already himself added this appendix, under the title *Idea (syllabus brevis) Graecar. N. T. Dialectorum*, to the first edition of his *Syllabus Graeco-Lat. omnium N. T. vocum*. Amstel. 1632. 12mo. At the end he promises the above full *Grammatica N. T.*

³ *Observatt. ad analog. et syntaxin Hebr.* Stuttg. 1779. 8vo. Some acute grammatical observations, especially on enallage temporum, particularum, and the like, are to be found in *J. G. Straube*, *diss. de emphasi graecae linguae N. T. in v. d. Honert*, p. 70 sqq.

attention merely to grammatical Hebraisms, and in the arrangement of the whole he followed the works of Storr and Weckherlin (Hebr. Gram. 19 2 Pts.). If the reviewer in *Bengel's Archiv* (1 B. S. 406 ff.) is to be credited, "the author has accomplished his task with such diligence, such sound judgment, such accuracy, and such nice and comprehensive knowledge of language, as must obtain for it the approbation of all friends of the well-grounded interpretation of the N. T." A very different and almost entirely opposite opinion has been expressed, however, by two scholars who must be regarded as most competent and impartial judges in this department: in the *n. theol. Annal.* 1816. 2 B. S. 859-879, and (by deWette?) in the *A. L.Z.* 1816. N. 39-41. S. 305-326. After long and various use of the book, I am compelled to say that I entirely concur in their decision. The principal fault of the book consists in the author's not having correctly distinguished the classic Greek element from the Hebraistic in the diction of the N. T., and in his having consequently adduced as Hebraistic much either that is common to all cultivated languages, or that occurs as frequently in the classics as in the N. T.; while from his partiality to Storr's views, he has quite misinterpreted numerous passages of the N. T. by forcing Hebraisms upon them (see proof below). Moreover, the book is full of confusion, the matter is arranged most arbitrarily, and the whole begins with a section on Tropes!—a subject not belonging to Grammar at all. The last of the reviewers mentioned above does not, accordingly, seem too severe in concluding his criticism with these words: "Seldom have we met a work which was so complete a failure as this, and against the use of which we must warn the public so emphatically." 7th ed.

§ 4. Further, the detached grammatical remarks in commentaries on the books of the N. T., in miscellanies, and in exegetical monographs, though sometimes exhibiting creditable research, failed to furnish, all taken together, a complete discussion of the Grammar of the N. T. These contributions, moreover, were rendered useless by that uncritical empiricism which controlled Greek Philology till the beginning of the present century, and Hebrew till a much more recent period; just as this same empiricism has imparted to the interpretation of the N. T. the impress of uncertainty and arbitrariness. The philosophical method of handling philological subjects,—that method which seeks in national and individual peculiarities of thought the grounds of all phenomena of speech, anomalies even not excepted,—has effected a complete revolution in the study of Greek; and the application of the same method to the language of the N. T. can alone invest the Grammar 20 of the N. T. with a scientific character, and elevate it to the dignity of a safe guide in interpretation.

The empiricism that pervaded Greek philology manifested itself in the department of Grammar mainly in the following particulars: a. The grammatical structure of the language was apprehended merely in the rudest outline; hence the relation of kindred forms, e.g. of the Aor. and Perf., of the Subjunctive and the Optative, of the twofold order of negatives (*οὐ* and *μη*), matters in which the genius of the Greek language is especially conspicuous, was left quite uncertain. b. In regard to those forms the distinctive power of which had been in general discerned, an unlimited interchange was asserted, according to which, one tense, one case, one particle, was used for another; and even direct opposites (e.g. Pret. and Fut., *ἀπό* and *πρός*, etc.) were supposed to be interchanged. c. A multitude of ellipses was devised, and in the most simple expression something was said to be understood. This method of procedure, still exhibited in Fischer's copious *Animad. ad Welleri Grammat. Gr.* (Lips. 1798 ff. 3 Spec. 8vo.), was applied by expositors to the N. T. They thought themselves warranted in using still greater liberties than Greek philologists, because the Hebrew, after which the diction of the N. T. was modelled, is characterized by want of precision in forms, and want of regularity in syntax, (which, therefore, was not treated systematically but only under the head of enallages and solecisms).¹ The natural consequences of such views were abundantly apparent in the N. T. commentaries of the time; and Storr² had the honor of reducing to a sort of system this farrago of grammatical empiricism. Apart from all other evils resulting from such principles, they afforded unbounded license to the caprice of expositors, and made it easy for them to discover in the words of the sacred authors sentiments quite contradictory.³

¹ This empiricism was but occasionally and partially combated by enlightened scholars. Thus numerous misapprehensions of expositors were pointed out, very intelligently on the whole, by the Wittenberg professors *Balth. Stolzberg*, in his *Tractat. de solecism. et barbarism. graecae N. F. dictioni falso tributis*. Vit. (1681.) 1685. 4to., and *Franz Woken*, in his dissertation entitled: *Pietas critica in hypallagas bibl. Viteb.* 1718. 8vo., and particularly in his *Enallagae e N. T. graeci textus praecipuis et plurimis locis exterminatae*. Viteb. 1730. 8vo. Also *J. Conr. Schwarz* evinces highly respectable research and judgment in his *Lib. de opinatis discipulor. Chr. solecismis*. Cob. 1730. 4to. Such protests, however, either obtained no attention, or were drowned by a *contorte! artificiose!*

² How entirely different from his acute countryman *Alb. Bengel*, in his *Gnomon*, who, though he is often drawn into over-refined expositions, and attributes to the apostles *his own* dialectic conceptions, might have served for years as a model of careful and instructive exposition. While he turned attention to grammatical inquiries (cf. e.g. Acts iii. 19; xxvi. 2; 1 Cor. xii. 15; Matt. xviii. 17; Heb. vi. 4.), he devoted special diligence in lexical matters to synonyms.

³ *Sunt*, says *Tittmann* (de scriptor. N. T. diligentia gramm. Lips. 1813. 4to., in *Synonym. N. T. I.* p. 206), qui grammaticarum legum observationem in N. T. interpretatione parum current et, si scriptoris cujusdam verba grammaticae i.e. ex legibus linguae explicata sententiam ab ipsorum opinione alienam prodant, nullam illarum legum rationem habeant, sed propria verborum vi neglecta scriptorem dixisse

The Greek philologists were the first to abandon this empiricism. Reitz's pupil, Gottfr. Hermann, by his work *De Emendanda Ratione Grammaticae Gr.*, gave the first powerful impulse to the *rational*¹ investigation of the noble Greek tongue. This method has now, after the lapse of more than fifty years, become so general, and produced such important results, and of late has allied itself so successfully to historical² research, that Greek grammar has become transformed. The treatment of the subject has been *rational*, because

a. The primary import of all grammatical forms (the cases, tenses, moods), that is, the notion corresponding to every such form in the Greek mind, was distinctly settled; and to this primary notion all actual uses of the same form were referred. Thus a multitude of ellipses disappeared, and enallage was reduced within its natural and narrow bounds.

b. Even in the case of such deviations from the established laws of the language as had been adopted, either generally or by individual authors, — anacoluthon, confusio duarum structurarum, attractio, constructio ad sensum, brachylogia, etc., — pains were taken to show how they originated in the mind of the speaker or writer.

The Greek language is thus exhibited as the expression of Greek thought — as a *living* idiom. Every form and turn of expression is not merely stated as a matter of fact, but is traced back to the thinking mind, and an attempt is made to comprehend it in its origin within the soul. By such a method every unintelligible usage disappears of itself, such as the assumption that a writer wishing to say a *past* event has employed a *fut.* tense; that intending to say *out of*, he has said *at*; that wishing to call some one *learned*, he has called him *more learned*; that meaning to subjoin a *cause*, he has written *consequently*; that desirous of saying *I saw a man*, he has said *I saw the man*, etc.

For a long time, however, Biblical philologists took no notice of all this progress in Greek grammar (and lexicography). They clung to old Viger and to Storr, and kept aloof from classical philology, under the impression (by no one distinctly avowed, to be sure, in recent times) that N. T. Greek, because Hebraistic, could not be subjected to the same philosophical method of inquiry. They would not perceive that Hebrew itself, like every other human language, admits and requires a philosophical treatment. Through the persevering efforts of Ewald, this truth is now universally acknowledged. No one now denies that the ultimate explanation of Hebrew modes of expression must be sought for in Hebrew modes of

contentant, *quae talibus verbis nemo sana mente praeditus dicere unquam potuit.* Hermann's (ad Vig. 788) satirical remarks were just.

¹ I should prefer this epithet to *philosophical*, because the latter may easily give rise to misunderstanding. All merely empirical philology is irrational; it regards language as something merely external, and not as the expression of thought. Cf. *Tittmann*, as above, S. 205 sq.

² *G. Bernhardt*, wissenschaftl. Syntax der griech. Sprache. Berl. 1829. 8vo.

thought, and that a simple-minded people would be the last to repudiate the fundamental principles of human speech.¹ Scholars are no longer content to give a preposition, for instance, the most diverse meanings according to the assumed requirements of a context superficially examined. But an endeavor is made to point out the transition from the primary import of every particle to every one of its secondary meanings; and without this, every alleged signification is regarded as an unscientific assumption. A student is no longer satisfied with the vague remark that to a Hebrew, *non omnis* — which in reason can only mean *not every one* — is the same as *omnis non*, that is, *nullus*; on the contrary, he refers to the true principle in every such case to be kept in view.

N. T. Grammar, therefore, must strive after a *rational* exposition of the language of the N. T. if it will attain a scientific basis itself, or secure the same in turn to exegesis. All that has been already achieved in Greek philology must be carefully turned to account. It must, however, be remembered, that not every nice distinction propounded by the linguists is to be viewed as established (and even the text perhaps altered accordingly), but that philology is constantly progressive. Many views have already required to be considerably modified (those, for instance, relating to the use of *et* with the subjunctive); others are still matters of disputation even among the best scholars (for instance, certain uses of *ἀν*).

23 Since 1824, N. T. Grammar in particular has received valuable contributions from Fritzsche, in his Dissertatt. in 2 Epist. ad Cor. (Lips. 1824.), in his Commentaries on Matthew and Mark, in his Conject. in N. T. Lips. 1825. 2 Spec. 8vo., and especially in his Comment. on the Epistle to the Romans, Hal. 1836. 8vo. To these must be added the Dissertations of Gieseler and Bornemann in Rosenmüller's Exeget. Repert. 2 B., as well as the latter's Scholia in Lucae Evang. Lips. 1830. 8vo., and, in part, his edition of the Acts of the Apostles (Acta Apost. ad Cod. Cantabrig. fidem rec. et interpr. est. Grossenhain, 1848. 8vo. I.). Finally, many grammatical questions have been discussed in the controversial correspondence between Fritzsche and Tholuck.²

¹ Rational investigation must be founded on historical. The whole field of language must first be historically surveyed, before we can explain individual phenomena. A simple language supposes simplicity of thought; and the explanation of forms and expressions is more easy in Hebrew, than in languages of less simplicity. The rational investigation of Hebrew implies tracing out all transitions from one signification of a word to another, all constructions and turns of expression, as they occurred in the Hebrew mind; since language is merely the image of thought (as thinking is, according to the Hebrew view itself, unuttered speech). To attempt to delineate *a priori* the laws of language is absurd. It is readily conceded that the rational method of investigation may be now and then misapplied, as even the Greek philologists have not escaped over-refinements. Adherence, however, to empirical stupidity from the apprehension of such danger is disgraceful.

² Fritzsche, Ueber die Verdienste D. Tholuck's um die Schrifterklärung. Halle. 1831. 8vo. Tholuck, Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des N. T. Halle. 1832. 8vo. Fritzsche,

Philological investigation into the language of the N. T. has not remained wholly without influence¹ on any of the numerous commentaries which have recently appeared, whether emanating from the critical, evangelical, or philosophical school of theology; although but a few of them 11 have treated philological points attentively and independently (as van Hengel, Lücke, Bleek, Meyer). An intelligent estimate of improved philological principles in their application to the N. T., has been given by H. G. Hölemann, *Comment. de interpretatione sacra cum profana feliciter conjungenda*. Lips. 1832. 8vo.

N. T. Grammar has recently found its way from Germany to England and North America; partly in a translation of the fourth edition of the present book (New York and London, 1840), and partly in a separate (original ?) work, entitled, *A Greek Grammar to the N. T., etc.*, by the Rev. William Trollope, M.A. London, 1842. 8vo. An earlier work on this subject, entitled, *A Grammar of the N. T. Dialect*, by Moses Stuart. Andover. 1841. 8vo., I have not yet seen. Moreover, the special grammatical characteristics of individual writers have begun to attract attention (yet see above, p. 4): Gl. Ph. Ch. Kaiser, *Diss. de Speciali Joa. Ap. Grammatica Culpa Negligentiae liberanda*. Erlang. 1842. II. 4to.; also *De Speciali Petri Ap. Grammatica Culpa Negligentiae liberanda*. Erlang. 1848. 4to.

[In Germany, too, works upon N. T. Grammar have since been issued by Alex. Buttmann (*Grammatik des N. T. Sprachgebrauchs. Im Anschlusse an Ph. Buttmann's griech. Grammatik*. Berl. 1859. 8vo.) and S. Ch. Schirlitz (*Grundzüge der N. T. Gräcität nach den besten Quellen für Studierende der Theol. u. Philol.* Giessen. 1861. 8vo.).]

Präliminarien zur Abbitte und Ehrenerklärung, die ich gern dem D. Tholuck gewähren möchte. Halle. 1832. 8vo. *Tholuck*, *Noch ein ernstes Wort an D. Fritzsche*. Halle. 1832. 8vo. *Tholuck* laid more stress on philological investigation in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hamb. 1836, 1840, 1850. 8vo. The anonymous author of *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Br. an die Hebr.* Leipz. 1840. 8vo., passes a severe judgment rather on the hermeneutical than the grammatical merits of *Tholuck*.

¹ Even on the commentaries of the excellent BCrusius, whose weakest side is undoubtedly the philological.

PART I.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION, ESPECIALLY IN ITS GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS.



§ 1. VARIOUS OPINIONS CONCERNING THE CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION.

1. **THOUGH** the character of the N. T. diction is pretty distinct and obvious, Biblical philologists long entertained erroneous, or at least imperfect and one-sided, views on the subject. For, dogmatic considerations, combined with ignorance of later Greek dialectology, rendered minds in other respects intelligent incapable of perceiving exegetical truth.

From the beginning of the 17th century various distinguished scholars (Purists) repeatedly attempted to demonstrate that the style of the N. T. reaches in every respect the standard of classical purity and elegance; while others (Hebraists) not only recognized its Hebrew coloring, but in part at least grossly exaggerated it. Towards the end of the 17th century the opinion of the Hebraists obtained the ascendancy; though it did not altogether suppress that of the Purists, which found very learned defenders. About the middle of the 18th century, however, the Purist party became extinct, and the principles of the Hebraists, slightly modified in some particulars, became universal. Not until very lately have scholars begun to perceive the one-sidedness of these principles, and to adopt the correct intermediate views which Beza and H. Stephanus had already in the main pointed out.

The history of the various opinions which from time to time were advanced, often with great controversial bitterness, respecting the Greek style of the N. T., is briefly related in Morus, *Acroas. acad. sup. Hermeneut. N. T.*, ed. Eichstädt, Tom. i. p. 216 sqq.; in Meyer, *Gesch. der Schrifterklär.* iii. 342 ff. (cf. Eichstädt, *Pr. sententiar. de dictione scriptor. N. T. brevis censura.* Jen. 1845. 4to.); with several important inaccuracies, in Planck, *Einleit. in d. theol. Wissensch.* ii. 43 ff. (cf. Stange, *theol. Symmiktä*,

ii. 295 ff.). For the bibliography of the subject see Walch, *biblioth. theol.* 13
 iv. 276 sqq.¹ From these sources, with occasional corrections, we present 7th ed.
 the following remarks as sufficient for our purpose : 12

Th. Beza, in his *Digressio de dono linguarum et apostol. sermone* (on 6th ed.
Acts x. 46), in reply to Erasmus's assertion *Apostolorum sermo non solum* 26
impolitus et inconditus verum etiam imperfectus et perturbatus, aliquoties
plane soloecissans, defended the simplicity and force of the N. T. diction ;
 and its Hebraisms in particular, which, as is well known, he was far from
 denying, he represented in a very advantageous light as *ejusmodi, ut nullo*
alio idiomate tam feliciter exprimi possint, imo interdum ne exprimi quidem,
 — in fact as *gemmae, quibus (apostoli) scripta sua exornarint*. After him,
 H. Stephanus, in the preface to his edition of the N. T. of 1576, combated
 the views of those qui in his scriptis *inculta omnia et horrida esse putant* ;
 and labored to show, by specimens, what fine Greek turns of expression
 occur in the style of the N. T., and that even the admixture of Hebraisms
 imparts to it inimitable force and expressiveness.

Though the beauties pointed out are rhetorical rather than linguistic,
 and the Hebraisms are overrated, yet the judgment of these two masters
 of Greek is not so one-sided as it is generally said to be, and on the whole
 comes nearer the truth than that of many later expositors.

After Drusius and Glass had specified and explained Hebraisms in the
 N. T. without opposition, extravagant notions were first promulgated by
 Seb. Pfochen, in his *Diatribe de linguae graecae N. T. puritate* (Amst.
 1629 ; ed. 2, 1633. 12mo.). Having in the preface stated the subject of
 his inquiry to be : an *stylus N. T. sit vere graecus nec ab aliorum Graecorum*
stylo alienior talisque, qui ab Homero, Demosthene aliisque Graecis intelligi
potuisset §§ 81–129, he endeavors to demonstrate by copious quotations,
graecos autores profanos eisdem phrasibus et verbis loquutos esse, quibus
scriptores N. T. (§ 29). This juvenile treatise (though in substance ap-
 proved by Erasmus Schmid, as afterwards appeared from his *Opus posthu-*
munum, 1658) seems, with its strict Purism, to have produced at the time no
 great impression.

The Hamburg rector Joach. Junge (1637, 1639) in reality, though indi-
 rectly, first gave rise to a *controversy* on the nature of the N. T. diction. 27
 His opponent, the Hamburg pastor Jac. Grosse (1640), though not endors- 14
 ing Junge's real opinion respecting the Hellenism (not barbarism)² of the 7th ed.

¹ See also *Baumgarten*, *Polemik*, iii. 176 ff. The opinions of the (apologetical)
 Fathers on the style of the N. T. is given summarily in *J. Lami*, *de erudit. apostolor.*
 p. 138 sqq. They treat the subject less under a philological than a rhetorical point of
 view. Theodore, *gr. affect. cur. s.*, triumphantly opposes the *σολοικισμοὶ ἁλιευτικοὶ* to
 the *ἐυλογισμοὶ ἀντικαὶ*.

² Junge himself thus states his true opinion, in a German memorial addressed to the
 Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1637 [cf. Joach. Jungius *Ueber die Originalsprache*
des N. T. vom Jahre 1637. Aufgefunden, zuerst herausgegeben und eingeleitet von
Joh. Geffcken. Hamb. 1863. 8vo.] : I have distinctly said, and I still say, that the style

13 N. T. style, admitted its harmlessness.¹ Dan. Wulfer, however, came
 14th ed. forward the same year with *Innocentia Hellenistarum vindicata* (see 1, etc.), in which he asserted that Grosse's reasoning was neither clear nor convincing.² Grosse had now to contend against Wulfer, whose misunderstandings he exposed, and also against Joh. Musaeus, the theologian of Jena (1641–42), who had charged him with vacillation and contradiction, but had in view rather his doctrinal opinions (respecting verbal inspiration); so that Grosse published, in all, five short dissertations (1641–42), vindicating, not indeed the Grecian elegance, but the purity and dignity of the language of the N. T.

Without mingling in these controversies, which descended into odious personalities and were nearly fruitless to science, Dan. Heinsius (1643) asserted the Hellenism of the N. T. diction; and Thom. Gataker (*de novi instrum. stylo dissert.* 1648) wrote expressly against the Purism of Pfochen, with learning, but not without exaggeration. Joh. Vorst now published (1658, 1665) an elaborate and perspicuous list of the Hebraisms of the N. T. which Hor. Vitringa shortly afterwards animadverted upon as highly partial.³

J. H. Böcler (1641) and J. Olearius (1668)⁴ adopted intermediate views, carefully discriminating between the Greek and the Hebrew elements in
 28 the style of the N. T., and J. Leusden agreed with them in the main, although he is inferior to Olearius in discretion.

of the N. T. is not classical Greek. The question an N. T. scateat barbarismis, is so outrageous, that no Christian man ever entertained it before; I never could be brought to admit that there are barbarous expressions in the N. T., because the Greeks themselves regard a barbarism as a vitium.

¹ His two leading positions are thus expressed: *quod quamvis evangelistae et apostoli in N. T. non adeo ornato et nitido, tumido et affectato (!) dicendi genere uti sint impium tamen, imo blasphemum sit, si quis inde S. literarum studiosus graecum stylum sugillare, vilipendere et juventuti suspectum facere ipsique vitia et notam solocismorum et barbarismorum attricare contendat Quod nec patres, qui solocismorum et barbarismorum meminere et apostolos idiotas fuisse scripserunt, nec illi autores, qui stylum N. T. hellenisticum esse statuerunt, nec isti, qui in N. T. Ebraismos et Chaldaismos esse observarunt, stylum S. apostolorum contemserint, sugillarint eumq. impuritatis alicujus accusarint cet.*

² *Grosse's* dissertation was specially directed against a possible inference from the proposition that the N. T. is not written in so good Greek as that employed by native Greek authors; and, essentially, refers to adversaries that (at least in Hamburg) had then no existence. Moreover his whole argument is rather of a negative kind, as appears for example from the résumé (p. 40 of *Grosse's Trias*): *etiamsi graecus stylus apostolorum non sit tam ornatus et affectatus, ut fuit ille qui fuit florente Graecia, non atticus ut Athenis, non doricus ut Corinthi, non ionicus ut Ephesi, non aeolicus ut Troade, fuit tamen vere graecus ab omni solocismorum et barbarismorum labe immunis.*

³ *Vorst* in the preface utters his conviction: *sacros codices N. T. talibus et vocabulis et phrasibus, quae hebraeam linguam sapiant, scatere plane.* Cf. further, his *Cogitata de stylo N. T.*, prefixed to Fischer's edition of the work *de Hebraismis*.

⁴ *J. Cocceji's* *structurae* in Pfochen. diatrib. were first printed solely for private distribution, and afterwards published in *Rhenferd's* collection.

It now came to be very generally admitted that Hebraisms constitute a prominent element in N. T. diction, and give it a coloring, not indeed barbarous, but widely removed from classic purity (see also Werenfels, *Opusc. i. p. 311 sqq.*).¹ The same view was advanced by Mos. Solanus, in a tardy but very sensible pamphlet against Pfochen. Even J. Heinr. Michaelis (1707) and Ant. Blackwall (1727) did not presume to deny the existence of Hebraisms, but tried to prove that the style of the N. T. writers, notwithstanding the Hebraisms, has all the properties of an elegant style, and in this respect is not inferior to the purity of the classics. The last-named scholar begins his work, which abounds in excellent remarks, thus: *tantum abest, ut hebraismos in N. T. reperiri infitiemur, ut eorum potius insignem, qua hic divinus abundat liber, copiam ad commoditatem ejus et elegantiam majorem afferre accessionem arbitremur.* As little effect, however, had these scholars on the now established opinion as the erudite Ch. Siegm. Georgi, who, in his *Vindiciae N. T. ab Ebraismis* (1732), returned to the strongest Purism; and in a new work, *Hierocriticus sacer* (1733), defended his assertions. He was followed, but with no greater success, by J. Conr. Schwarz, whose *Commentarii crit. et philol. linguae gr. N. T.* Lips. 1736. 4to., chiefly aimed at demonstrating the Greek purity even of expressions taken for Hebraisms.² To these must be added, as the last who opposed the misuse of Hebraisms, El. Palairret (*observatt. philol. crit. in N. T. L. B. 1752. 8vo.*),³ and H. W. van Marle (*florileg. observ. in epp. apost. L. B. 1758. 8vo.*). Through the influence of the school of Ernesti, the more correct estimate of the language of the N. T. was generally diffused over Germany.⁴ Cf. Ernesti's *Institut. Interpret. i. 2. cap. 3.*

¹ *Hemsterhuis* ad *Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3*: eorum, qui orationem N. T. graecam esse castigatissimam contendunt, opinio perquam mihi semper ridicula fuit visa. Also, *Blth. Stolberg*, de soloecismis et barbarismis N. T. Viteb. 1681. 4to. and 1685. 4to., wished merely to vindicate the N. T. diction from blemishes unjustly ascribed to it; but, in fact, attempted to explain away many real Hebraisms.

² In the anticipation of certain victory he says in p. 8 of his preface: *olim hebraismi, syrisimi, chaldaismi, rabinismi (sic!), latinismi cet. celebrabantur nomina, ut vel scriptores sacri suam graecae dictionis ignorantiam prodere aut in graeco sermone tot linguarum notitiam ostentasse viderentur vel saltem interpretes illorum literatissimi et singularum locutionum perspicacissimi judicarentur. Sed conata haec ineptiarum et vanitatis ita sunt etiam a nobis convicta, ut si qui cet. A satire on the Purists will be found in *Somnium* in quo praeter cetera genius sec. vapulat. Alteburg. 1761, p. 97 sqq.*

³ Supplements by Pal. himself may be seen in the *Biblioth. Brem. nova Cl. 3* and *4*. On the whole, Pal. produces passages almost exclusively in defence of such significations and phrases, as no judicious person would take to be Hebraisms.

⁴ *Ernesti's* view of the N. T. diction (*diss. de difficult. interpret. grammat. N. T. § 12*) may be recalled here: *genus orationis in libris N. T. esse e pure graecis et ebraicam maxime consuetudinem referentibus verbis formulisque dicendi mixtum et temperatum, id quidem adeo evidens est iis, qui satis graece sciunt, ut plane misericordia digni sint, qui omnia bene graeca esse contendunt.*

29 Most of the above-mentioned old dissertations (besides others), written
 16 in the Purist controversy, are collected in J. Rhenferd's Dissertatt. philolog.
 theolog. de Stylo N. T. syntagma, Leov. 1702. 4to., and in (what may be
 considered as a supplement to Rhenferd's collection) Taco Hajo van den
 Honert, Syntagma dissertatt. de stylo N. T. graeco. Amst. 1703. 4to.¹

15 Let us endeavor briefly to characterize the efforts of those who attrib-
 uted classical purity to the N. T. diction.²

Their great object was to collect from native Greek authors passages in which those very same words and phrases occur which are found in the N. T., and are there explained as Hebraisms. Now, apart from the circumstance that what is strictly speaking the body of the language was not in general distinguished from the rhetorical element, the Purists entirely overlooked the following considerations :

a. That numerous expressions and phrases (particularly such as are figurative), owing to their simplicity and naturalness, are common to all, or at least to many languages, and cannot with propriety be called either Grecisms or Hebraisms.³

b. That a distinction is to be made between the diction of prose and that of poetry, and also between figurative expressions employed very rarely and by individual authors to give composition a peculiar elevation (as *lumina orationis*), and those which have become the common property of the language ; and that, if in plain prose like that of the N. T. expressions used by Pindar, Æschylus, Euripides,⁴ etc. occur, or if such expressions, as well as rare Greek figurative phrases, recur as ordinary phraseology, this by no means proves the classical purity of the N. T.

c. That when an expression is found alike in Hebrew and in Greek, the training and history of the writers of the N. T. render it in general more

¹ The dissertations of *Wulfer*, *Grosse*, and *Musæus*, though of trifling importance compared to their size, are missed with regret from this collection, and more of *Junge's* than the *sententiae doct. vir. de stylo N. T.* should have been admitted. Besides, cf. *Blessig*, *praesidia interpret. N. T. ex auctorib. graec.* Argent. 1778. 4to., and *Mittenzwey*, *locorum quorundam e Hutchinsoni ad Xenoph. Cyrop. notis, quib. purum et elegans N. T. dicendi genus defenditur, refutatio.* Coburg. 1763. 4to. An essay by *G. C. Draudius*, *de stylo N. T.*, in the *Primitt. Alsfeld.*, Nürnberg. 1736. 8vo., I have not seen ; (see *Neubauer*, *Nachr. von jetzt lebenden Theol.* i. 253 ff.).

² *Mittenzwey* made some remarks on this in his Essay, already mentioned.

³ Simplicity and graphic expression are common to Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek with the diction of Homer ; and particular phrases having these characteristics could with as little propriety be called Hebraisms in the latter as Grecisms in the former. In general, languages have points of contact, especially in popular speech, which is universally simple and graphic ; while cultivated diction, as it is coined by the learned, is more isolated. Hence in Latin, for instance, most of what are called Germanisms are to be found in the style of comedies, epistles, etc.

⁴ See, on the other hand, *Krebs*, *observ. praef. p. 3.* *Leusden*, *de dialect. p. 37*, says, with great absurdity : *nos non fugit, carmina istorum hominum (tragicor.) innumeris hebraismis esse contaminata.* Accordingly *Fischer*, ad *Leusden*, p. 114, finds Hebraisms in the poems of Homer.

probable that such expression is copied immediately from the Hebrew, than that it is borrowed from the choicer literary language of Greece. 30 Not to mention,

d. That those uncritical collectors huddled together many passages out of Greek authors where, α . the same word indeed occurs, but in a different 17 signification; or, β . expressions are found only similar, not identical. 7th ed. Further,

e. That they unhesitatingly used even the Byzantine writers, into whose language, through the influence of the church, many elements of the Hebraizing N. T. phraseology may have been transferred (as in particular 16 instances can be proved to be extremely probable; cf. Niebuhr, Index to 6th ed. Agath. under $\zeta\eta\mu\omega\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$); and, at all events, these Byzantine authors are not standards of classic Greek purity. Finally,

f. That they passed over, and were forced to pass over, many expressions in silence, because they are undeniable Hebraisms.¹

Thus the evidence produced in favor of Purism was partly defective and partly irrelevant. Besides, most of the Purists restricted themselves mainly to the lexical side of the question; Georgi alone discussed the grammatical with a fulness sustained by stores of erudition.

In proof of the preceding statements, we subjoin several striking examples (cf. also Mori *acroas.* l. c. p. 222 sqq.): And as respects

a. Matt. v. 6, $\pi\epsilon\omega\omega\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\upsilon\phi\omega\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\eta\eta\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\eta$. Examples are produced from Xenophon, Æschines, Lucian, Artemidorus, to prove that $\delta\upsilon\phi\eta\eta$, in this (figurative) sense, is pure Greek. But it is so used in Latin also, and in nearly all languages; it cannot, therefore, be regarded as a Grecism any more than a Hebraism. The same holds of $\epsilon\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\omega$ ($\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\omega$) in the figurative sense of *consume, waste*. This cannot be proved from Iliad 23, 182 to be a Grecism, nor from Deut. xxxii. 22 etc. to be a Hebraism; but it is common to all languages. In the same way we might dispense with parallels to $\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ *generation* i.e. the individuals of a particular generation (Georgi, Vind. p. 39), to $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho$ *power*, to $\delta\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omega\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \omicron\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\varsigma$, and the like. And it is really ridiculous when Matt. x. 27 $\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\xi\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\omega\eta\ \delta\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\eta$ is authenticated by Æsop. 139, 1, $\xi\rho\iota\phi\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\iota\eta\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$. Pfochen's dissertation contains a great number of such idle and preposterous remarks.

b. That $\kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ signifies *mori* is proved from the Iliad 11, 241 (Georgi, vind. p. 122 sqq.) $\kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\epsilon\omicron\eta\eta\ \psi\pi\eta\eta\eta$, and Soph. Electr. 510; that $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$ is used also by the Greeks for *proles* is proved chiefly from the poets, as Eurip. Iph. Aul. 524; Iph. Taur. 987; Hec. 254, and Soph. Electr. 1508 (Georgi, vind. p. 87 sqq.); that $\pi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\eta\eta\eta$ means *regerere*, from Anacr. 57, 8; that $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\eta$ and $\lambda\epsilon\omega\pi\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta\ \delta\acute{\alpha}\eta\alpha\tau\omicron\eta\eta$ are good Greek, from 81 Soph. Electr. 205 (Schwarz, Comm. p. 410), or from $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\eta\eta$,

¹ This applies also to J. E. Ostermann, whose *Positiones philologicae graecum N. T. contextum concernentes* have been reprinted in *Crenii exercitatt.* fasc. ii. p. 485 sqq.

σκότον, in tragedians. For ποτήριον πίνειν in a figurative sense (Matt. xx. 22), Schwarz quotes Æschyl. Agam. 1397. That πίπτειν signifies *irritum esse*, the established meaning in Hebrew, the same writer proves by Plato's figurative expression, δοκεῖ ἡδονὴ σοι πεπτωκέναι καταπερεὶ πλεγείσα ὑπὸ τῶν νῦν δὴ λόγων, Phileb. p. 22. e.

c. The phrase γινώσκειν ἄνδρα, though not unknown in Greek (Jacobs, 18 ad Philostr. imagg. p. 583), may be derived with assurance directly from 1st ed. the common Hebrew phrase עָרַב אִישׁ, and regarded in our authors as a Hebraism. In like manner σπλάγχνα *compassion*, ξηρά *land* as opposed to water (Fischer ad Leusden dialectt. 31), χεῖλος in the sense of *shore*, στόμα for *edge of a sword* (cf., however, Boissonade, Nic. p. 282), παχύνειν *to be stupid, foolish*, κύριος κυρίων, εἰσέρχασθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον are primarily, 17 no doubt, copied from the Hebrew, and are not to be proved to be pure 6th ed. Greek by parallels from Herodot., Ælian, Xenophon, Diodor. Sic., Philostratus, and others.

d. a. That ἐν is used by Greek authors to express the *casus instrumentalis* — which with certain limitations is true — Pfochen tries to prove by such quotations as: πλέων ἐν ταῖς ναυσί (Xenoph.), ἦλθε . . . ἐν νηὶ μελαίνῃ (Hesiod)! That good Greek authors use ῥῆμα for *res* is said to be apparent from Platt. legg. 797 c. (τοῦτου ῥήματος καὶ τοῦ δόγματος οὐκ εἶναι ζημίαν μείζω), where ῥῆμα may be translated *verdict*, decision. Χορτάζειν *to fill*, (of persons), is proved to be pure Greek from Plat. rep. 2, 372, where it refers to *swine*! Ζητεῖν ψυχὴν τινος is affirmed to be classical, from Eur. Io. 1112; Thuc. 6, 27, etc., where ζητεῖν alone, occurs in the sense of *insidiari*, or rather *seek for* (in order to kill). That ὀφειδῆμα in good Greek signifies *peccatum*, Schwarz tries to prove by Plat. Cratyl. 400 c., where, however, ὀφειλόμενα denotes as elsewhere *debita*. Equally inappropriate are most of the passages from which Georgi (Hierocrit. p. 36 sq., 186 sq.) attempts to show that in the best Greek authors the prepositions εἰς and ἐν are interchanged, as they are in the N. T. Cf. also Krebs, Obs. p. 14 sq.

β. That εὐρίσκειν χάριν (ἔλεος) παρὰ τινι is not a Hebraism, Georgi (Vind. p. 116) tries to demonstrate from a passage of Demosthenes containing the words εὐρίσκεσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην, τὴν δωρεάν, as if the Hebraism in question did not lie rather in the whole phrase (for there is nothing peculiar to Hebrew in using *find for obtain*), and as if nothing depended on the middle voice. Palairot quotes Aristoph. Acharn. κρατὴρ αἵματος, and similar expressions, to justify the use of ποτήριον for *sors*; and Schwarz defends πίπτειν *irritum esse* by a reference to Plat. Euthyphr. 14 d. οὐ χαμαὶ πεσέται, ὅτι ἂν εἴποις. Passages containing the words οὔτε μέγα οὔτε μικρόν were quoted to show that the well-known *Merismus ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου* is pure Greek (Georgi, Vind. p. 310 sqq.; Schwarz, Comment. p. 917; cf. Schäfer, Julian. p. xxi.). In such *Merismus* itself, 82 however, there is nothing Hebraistic, but only in the particular formula

given above ἀπὸ μικρ. ἕως μεγ. Theophan. Cont. p. 615 Bekk. is the first writer in whom this form occurs. Καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας, ὁσφύος, Georgi (Vind. p. 304) supports by passages in which καρπός alone is used to denote the fruit of the human body. Aristoph. Nub. πλέον πλέον, *more and more*, is not sufficient to prove that δύο δύο, *two and two*, is a Grecism; it would be necessary to produce examples where the repeated cardinal is employed for ἀνὰ δύο, ἀνὰ τρεῖς, etc., § 37, 3. In the same way ὅσσα δ' ἀκούσας εἰσεθέμην is vainly quoted from Callimachus to prove that τιθέναι εἰς τὰ ὄρα is pure Greek, as the two phrases are essentially unlike each other. Yet such specimens might be multiplied without end. What Georgi, Vind. p. 25, produces from Arrian. Epictet. in defence of ὁ ἀδελφός ¹⁹ ^{7th ed.} alter, seems peculiarly ridiculous.

e. Schwarz, p. 1245, asserts, on the usage of Nicetas, the pure Greek character of the phrase στήριζεν τὸ πρόσωπον and the word ἐνωπίζεσθαι; and Palaiet proves that of ἡ ξηρά in the sense of *continent*, from Jo. Cinnam. hist. iv. p. 183. Pfochen still more oddly vindicates the use of κοινός to signify *immundus*, from Lucian, Mort. Peregrin. c. 13, where Lucian derisively employs a Judeo-Christian expression.

f. Of the numerous Hebraistic words and phrases which the Purists passed over in silence, it will suffice to mention: πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, σὰρξ ¹⁸ καὶ αἷμα, υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐξ ὁσφύος τινός, ποιεῖν ἔλεος (χάριν) μετὰ ^{6th ed.} τινος, ἀποκρίνεσθαι without a preceding question, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι θεῷ (*to praise God*) and many others; see § 3.

After Salmasius, whose work De Lingua Hellen. later scholars had quite forgotten, Sturz's dissertation De Dialecto Alexandrina (Lips. 1784, 4to., and Ger. 1788–93, 4to.), 2d enlarged ed. Lips. 1809, 8vo., led the way to a correct estimate of N. T. diction, particularly as respects its basis, the Greek. (For able observations on Sturz, see the Heidelb. Jahrb. 1810. 18 Hft, S. 266 ff.) On this subject, therefore, Keil (Lehrb. der Hermeneut. S. 11 f.), Bertholdt (Einleit. in d. Bib. 1 Th. S. 155 f.), Eichhorn (Einleit. ins N. T. 4 Bd. S. 96 ff.), and Schott (Isagoge in N. T. p. 497 sqq.) have written more satisfactorily than many earlier critics, but without exhausting the subject, and without exhibiting the requisite scientific precision. In both these respects the younger Planck has surpassed his predecessors; and (avoiding a fundamental mistake into which Sturz fell) he was the first to unfold clearly, and on the whole correctly, the character of the N. T. diction, in his De vera natura atque indole orationis graecae N. T. comment. Gott. 1810, 4to. (reprinted in Commentatt. theol. v. Rosenmüller, l. 1. p. 112 sqq.). Cf. his Pr. Observatt. quaedam ad hist. verbi gr. N. T. ibid. 1821, 4to. (and in Commentatt. theol. v. Rosenmüller, l. 1. p. 193 sqq.). See also (de Wette) A. Lit. Z. 1816, No. xxix. S. 306.

In the age of Alexander the Great and his successors the Greek language underwent an internal change of a double nature. On the one hand, a literary prose language was formed, which was founded on the Attic dialect, yet differed from it by adopting a common Greek element, and even admitting numerous provincialisms (ἡ κοινὴ or ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος). On the other hand, a popular spoken language arose, in which the previously distinct dialects spoken by the various Greek tribes were blended, with a predominance of the Macedonic variety.¹ This latter compound, varying in some respects in the various provinces of Asia and Africa subjected to the Macedonian rule, constitutes the special foundation of the diction of the N. T., as it does also of the Septuagint and Apocrypha. Its peculiarities, — further modified by a disregard of nice distinctions, and by an effort after perspicuity and also after commodious forms of expression, — may be fitly ranged under two heads: *Lexical* and *Grammatical*.

The older dissertations on Greek Dialectology, so far as regards the κοινὴ διάλεκτος in particular, are now nearly useless. The subject is well, though briefly, treated by Matthiae (ausführl. Gramm. § 1–8) and still more thoroughly by Buttmann (ausführl. griech. Sprachlehre, S. 1–8), and also, though not with complete accuracy, by Planck l. c. p. 13–23. Cf. besides, Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 262 sq., and Bernhardt, S. 28 ff.

The Jews in Egypt and Syria² — and to these we confine our remarks — learned Greek principally from oral intercourse with Greeks, and not from books.³ It is not surprising, then, that even in writing they retained,

¹ Sturz, de dial. maced. et alex. p. 26 sqq. Yet the subject requires a new and thorough investigation; decisions such as that in Thiersch de Pentat. LXX. p. 74, can by no means settle the question.

² A precise distinction cannot be drawn between what belonged to the language of Alexandria, and what was peculiar to the variety of Greek used in Syria (and Palestine); and even if it could, it would be of little importance as respects the N. T. Eichhorn's attempt (Einl. ins N. T. IV. 124 ff.) is a failure, and could not be otherwise, as it was conducted with little judgment. Εὐχαριστεῖν, used by Demosthenes even, and from the time of Polybius by many writers, he pronounces an addition to the Alexandrian diction! ξενίζειν hospitio excipere, which is found not only in Xenophon but even in Homer, is labelled as an Alexandrian word! To what extent Greek was spoken by the Jews of Syria (and Palestine) we need not here inquire; on this point see Paulus, de Jud. Palaest. Jesu et apostolor. tempore non aram. dialecto sed graeca quoque locutis. Jen. 1803. II. 4; Hug, Einleitung, II. 31 ff.; my Realwörterb. II. 502; Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, S. 61 f.

³ That the style of the Greek-speaking Jews was affected by the perusal of the Septuagint makes no essential difference here, where we have in view mainly the classic

for the most part, the peculiarities of the popular spoken language. This 34
 was the case with the LXX., the writers of the N. T., and the authors of
 many (the Palestin.) Apocrypha. Only a few learned Jews, who prized 21
 and studied Grecian literature, such as Philo and Josephus,¹ attained a 7th ed.
 style approximating to literary Greek. Though that popular variety of
 Greek is no longer perfectly known,² yet, from a comparison of the Hel-
 lenistic language (Hebraisms excepted) with the later literary prose, it
 appears that, departing still more noticeably from classic elegance, it had 20
 adopted in greater abundance new and provincial words and forms, and 6th ed.
 begun to neglect more decidedly nice distinctions of construction and idiom,
 to violate grammatical proprieties (their origin and grounds being lost
 sight of), and to extend many corruptions already manifesting themselves
 in the literary diction. Its main characteristic, however, continued to be
 such an intermixing of the previously distinct dialects (Lobeck, Pathol.
 p. 9.), that each province retained its own local variety as the basis of the
 provincial style; — the Alexandrian retaining a predominance of Atticisms
 and Doricisms.

We shall now endeavor to portray more minutely the later elements,
 both lexical and grammatical — of which the former are the more obvious
 — of the Hellenistic Greek which took its rise from the dialect spoken in
 Egypt, particularly in Alexandria (*dialectus Alexandrina*).³ In doing

Greek element. Moreover, that no profound Greek scholarship can be ascribed even
 to the Apostle Paul (see, among others, *Pföchen*, p. 178) is now generally admitted.
 He undoubtedly possessed a greater mastery of Greek than such of the sacred writers
 as were natives of Palestine. This, however, he might easily attain in Asia Minor,
 and by his considerable intercourse with native Greeks, some of whom were persons of
 learning and distinction. *Köster*, in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1854. 2 (ob P. seine Sprache
 an der des Demosth. gebildet habe) brings together Demosthenic words and phrases,
 of nearly all of which it must be said that either Paul might have learned them from
 the spoken language of the educated, or that they are unlike the diction of the Attic
 orator. Copious command of Greek in the case of men who associated so much with
 Greeks does not suffice to prove them students of Greek literature.

¹ A comparison of portions of the earlier books of the Antiquities with the corres-
 ponding portions of the Septuagint, proves particularly that the style of Josephus is
 not to be put on a level with that of the Septuagint, or even of the N. T., and renders
 obvious the difference between a Jewish and a Greek narrative style. Cf. besides,
Schleiermacher, *Herm.* S. 63.

² Hence a "complete view of the language of common life," which *Schleiermacher*,
Herm. S. 59, would fain see, can never be given.

³ On this (*περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρινῆς διαλέκτου*) the grammarians *Irenaeus* (Pacatus) and
Demetrius Ixion had written special works, which are now lost. See *Sturz*, *dial. maced.*
et alex. p. 24, not. 4, cf. p. 19 sq. As extant specimens of this dialect, besides the well-
 known Rosetta inscription, are to be considered: Papyri graeci reg. Taurin. musei
 aegyptii ed. et illustr. a *A. Peyron*. Turin, 1827. 2 Vol. 4to., and the same author's
Illustrazione di due papiri graeco-egizi dell' imper. museo di Vienna, in the *Memorie*
dell' academ. di Torino, Tom. 33, p. 151 sqq. of the histor. class; Description of the
 Greek Papyri in the British Museum, Lond. 1839. 4to. Tom. 1; *J. A. Letronne*, *Recueil*
des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Egypte, etc. Paris, 1842 and 1848, 2 Tom. 4to.

this, we shall constantly avail ourselves of the researches of Sturz, Planck,
 35 Lobeck,¹ Boissonade, and others. For the passages they quote in proof
 (chiefly from the writers of the *κουνή*, Polybius, Plutarch, Strabo, Ælian,
 Artemidorus, Appian, Heliodorus, Sext. Empiricus, Arrian, etc.)² the
 reader must be referred to the works of these critics themselves. What
 appears to have belonged exclusively to the popular spoken language, and
 22 is not to be found in any profane Greek author, we shall mark with an
 7th ed. asterisk.³

21 1. LEXICAL PECULIARITIES: a. The later dialect comprised words
 6th ed. and forms from all the Greek dialects, without distinction; as, for instance,
from the Attic: ὕαλος (Lob. 309), ὁ σκότος, ἀετός (Herm. Praef. ad Soph.
 Ai. p. 19), φιάλη, ἀλήθειν (Lob. 151), πρίμνα (Lob. 331), ἰλαός; *from the*
Doric: πιάζω (πιέζω), κλίβανος (Lob. 179), ἡ λιμός, ποία (*grass*, instead of
 ποιή or πία), βεμβράνας, which Zonaras quotes from 2 Tim. iv. 13, where
 however all our Codd. give μεμβρ., see Sturz, Zonarae glossae sacrae.
 Grimmae, 1820. 4to. P. II. p. 16; *from the Ionic*: γογγύζω (Lob. 358),
 ῥήσσω, πρηγής (yet already used in Aristot., see Lob. 431), βαθμός (Lob.
 324), σκορπίζειν (Lob. 218), ἄρσιν (Bttm. I. S. 84, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 78).
Ionic and Doric is (εἰλίσσειν Rev. vi. 14 var.; cf. Mtth. I. 69) φύω in an
 intransitive sense (Heb. xii. 15, cf. Babr. 64.). Grammarians note as
Macedonic, παρεμβολή *camp* (Lob. 377, cf. Schwarz, Soloec. ap. 66), ῥύμη
street; as of *Cyrenaic* origin, βουνός *hill* (Lob. 355 sqq.); as *Syracusan*,
 the imperative εἰπόν (Fritzsche, ad Mr. p. 515).

b. The later dialect attached new significations to words already existing
 in the ancient language: παρακαλεῖν and ἐρωτᾶν* *entreat*, παιδεύειν *chastise*,

¹ Yet see even *Olear. de stylo*, p. 279 sqq.

² In studying the peculiarities of later Greek, the church Fathers and the books of
 Graeco-Roman law have hitherto been turned to scarcely any account. To the latter
 frequent reference will be made in the course of this treatise. How far the N. T. diction,
 through the influence of the church, affected the later Byzantine Greek, is reserved for
 separate inquiry. The Pseudepigrapha of the O. T. and the Apocrypha of the N. T.,
 that is certain portions of them, are now available more completely, and in a better
 text; the latter through the labors of *Tdf.* The style of these clumsy compositions,
 though not by any means uniform, is on the whole so poor that the N. T. diction seems
 like classic Greek in comparison. Cf. besides, *Tdf. de evangel. apocryph. origine et*
usu, in the *Verhandeligen uitgeven door het Haagsche Genootschap*, etc. 12 Thl.
 1851. 8vo.

³ The Greek grammarians, particularly Thomas Mag. (the latest edition by *Ritschl*,
 Halle, 1832. 8vo.), specify as common Greek much that is not unknown even to standard
 Attic (see e.g. *θεμέλιος*, Th. M. p. 437, and *ἐρευνᾶμαι*, p. 363), and even fall sometimes
 into gross mistakes. Cf. *Oudendorp*, ad Thom. M. p. 903. Much that, after Alexander
 the Great, forced its way into the written language, undoubtedly was current before in
 the popular speech (as, perhaps, *σπρηγιῶν*, which first appears in the poets of the New
 Comedy). Besides, the N. T. writers frequently employ forms and words preferred by
 the Atticists, instead of those characterized as common Greek; e.g. *χρηστότης*, Thom.
 M. p. 921, ἡ (not δ) λαίλαψ, Thom. M. 864.

εὐχαριστεῖν thank (Lob. 18), *ἀνακλίνειν, ἀναπίπτειν, ἀνακείσθαι, to recline at table* (Lob. 216), *ἀποκριθῆναι answer* (Lob. 108), *ἀντιλέγειν oppose*, *ἀπο- 36*
τάσσεσθαι valere jubere, renuntiare (Lob. 23 sq.), *συγκρίνειν compare* (Lob. 278), *δαίμων, δαιμόνιον, evil spirit*,¹ *ξύλον (living) tree* (Passow, sub verb.), *διαπονέσθαι aegre ferre**, *στέγειν hold off, endure, σεβάζεσθαι revere* (equiv-
 alent to *σέβεσθαι*, Fr. Rom. I. 74), *συνίστημι prove, establish* (Fr. Rom. I. 159), *χρηματίζειν be called* (Fr. Rom. II. 9), *φθάνειν come, arrive* (Fr. Rom. II. 356 sq.), *κεφαλὴς volume (roll) of a book* (Bleek on Heb. x. 7), *εὐσχήμων a respectable, prominent, man* (Lob. 333), *ψωμίζειν and χορτάζειν*
*(fodder) feed, nourish**,² *ὀψώνιον wages* (Sturz, 187), *ὀψάριον fish, ἐρεύγε- 23*
σθαι eloqui (Lob. 63 sq.), *ἐπιστέλλειν write a letter (ἐπιστολή), περισπᾶσθαι 7th ed*
negotiiis distrahi (Lob. 415), *πτῶμα corpse* (Lob. 375), *γενήματα fruges*
(Lob. 286), σχολή school (Lob. 401), *θυρεός large (door-shaped) shield*
(Lob. 366), δῶμα house-top, λοιβή offering (Babr. 23, 5), *ῥύμη street*
(Lob. 404 sq.), παῖρρηγία assurance, confidence, λαλιά speech (dialect),
*λαμπάς lamp, καταστολή long robe**, *νυνί now* (in Attic, *this instant*) Fr. Rom. I. 182, *στάμνος*, which in the classics denotes a vessel for holding
 liquids, was used to signify also a vessel for dry articles, Babr. 108, 18. 22 6th ed

A special peculiarity was to give neuter verbs the transitive or causative signification;³ as, *μαθητεύειν* (Matt. xxviii. 19), *θραμβεύειν* (2 Cor. ii. 14? yet see Mey.), in the Sept. even *ζῆν, βασιλεύειν*, and many others; cf. especially, Psalm xli. 3; cxviii. 50; cxxxviii. 7, etc., cf. § 32, l. see Lydius de re mil. 6. 3, esp. Lob. Soph. Ai. p. 382 sqq. Lastly, in the case of *μέθυσος*, usage at least so far changed that the word, previously confined to females, was applied to both sexes (Lob. 151 sq.; Schäfer, ind. ad Æsop. p. 144).

c. Words and forms which in classical Greek were seldom used, or only by poets and in the more elevated kinds of style, became ordinary and favorite, and were employed even in common prose; such as, *αἰθεντεῖν to lord it* (Lob. 120), *μεσονύκτιον* (Thom. M. 609; Lob. 53), *ἀλάλητος (?)*, *θεοστυγής* (Pollux 1, 21), *ἑσθησις* (Th. M. 370), *ἀλέκτωρ (ἀλεκτρυνών, Lob. 229), βρέχειν irrigare* (Lob. 291), *ἔσθω* (for *ἐσθίω*) Btm. II. 185. To

¹ That is, as its inherent signification; for, from the context, the word means this in the Iliad, 8, 166, as also in Dinarch. adv. Demosthen. § 30, p. 155, Bekk., a passage quoted by recent scholars. Even the Byzantines for precision add *κακὸς* to *δαίμων*, Agath. 114, 4.

² This extended meaning might be considered also as a Hebraism; *ψωμίζειν* was commonly used as quite equivalent to *לֶחֶם יִשְׁמְרֵם* (cf. Grimm on Wisd. xvi. 20), like *χορτάζειν*, which in Greek authors is not applied to persons. (In opposition to Pföchen, see Solanus in Rhenferd, p. 297.) It is uncertain whether *δεκαδύο* for *δῶδεκα* belongs to the later popular Greek, or was first formed by the LXX. The first seems to me the more probable, for *לְעֶשְׂרִים וְשְׁנַיִם דֶּשֶׁדֶּקָּה* corresponds more exactly than *δεκαδύο*.

³ Transitive verbs are more convenient in construction than intransitive. Later Greek even employed the construction *προσάπτειν τινα* (Acta apocr. p. 172); just as in German *etwas widersprechen* is the more familiar phrase; in the language of trade we hear, *das Rüböl ist gefragt*.

the same head Eichhorn (Einl. ins N. T. IV. 127) refers the phrase *θέσθαι* *τὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, employed it is said in solemn style by the poets particularly the tragedians, since it occurs in the N. T. in the plainest prose. But the
 37 Homeric phrase *ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθαι* is only similar, not identical. The expression *συντηρεῖν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, cited by the same author as a solemn formula, is used also in the N. T. as emphatic. *Κοράσιον*, on the other hand, is to be regarded as an example of a word which, dropping its secondary import, was adopted into the literary style from the colloquial (Lob. 74), cf. Germ. *müdel*.

d. Many words which had long been in use received another form or pronunciation, which generally supplanted its predecessor; such as, *μετοι-
 κεία* (*μετοικία*), *ικεσία* (*ικετεία*, Lob. 504), *ἀνάθημα* (*ἀνάθημα*, Schäf. Plutarch.
 V. p. 11), *ἀνάστημα*, *γενέσια* (*γενέθλια*, Lob. 104), *γλωσσόκομον* (*γλωσσο-
 κομείον*, Lob. 98 sq.), *ἔκπαλαι* (*πάλαι*, Lob. 45 sq.), *ἐχθές* (*χθές*), *ἐξάπνα*
 24 (*ἐξάπνῃς*), *αἵτημα* (*αἵτησις*), *ψεῦσμα* (*ψεῦδος*, Sallier ad Th. M. 927), *ἀπάν-
 7th ed. τησις* (*ἀπάντημα*), *ἡγησις* (*ἡγεμονία*), *λυχνία* (*λυχνίον*, Lob. 314), *νίκος* (*νίκη*,
 Lob. 647), *οἰκοδομή* (*οἰκοδόμησις*, Lob. 490), *ὄνειδισμός*, Lob. 512 (*ὄνειδος*,
ὄνειδισμα, Her. 2, 133), *ὀπτασία* (*ὄψις*), ἡ *ὀρκωμοσία* (*τὰ ὀρκωμόσια*), *μισθα-
 ποδοσία* (*μισθοδοσία*), *συγκυρία* (*συγκύρησις*), *ἀποστασία* (*ἀπόστασις*, Lob.
 528), *νοθεσία* (*νουθέτησις*, Lob. 512), *ἀπαρτισμός* (*ἀπάρτισις*), *μελίσσιος*
(μελίσσειος), *ποταπός* (*ποδαπός*, Lob. 56), *βασίλισσα* (*βασίλεια*),¹ *μοιχαλὶς*
(μοιχάς Lob. 452), *μονόφθαλμος* (*ἐτερόφθαλμος*, Lob. 136), *καμμύνειν* (*κατα-
 μύνειν*, Sturz, p. 123), *ὄψιμος* (*ὄψιος*, Lob. 52), ὁ *πλησίον* (*ὁ πέλας*), *προσήλυτος*
(ἔπηλυς, Valcken. ad Ammon. p. 32), *φυσιοῦσθαι* (*φυσᾶν*) *to be ruffed up*
(trop. Babr. 114), *ἀτενίζειν* since Polybius for *ἀτενίζεσθαι* (Passow), *ἐκχύνειν*
 23 (*ἐκχέειν*, Lob. 726), *στηκώ* (from *ἔστηκα stand*, Bttm. II. 36), *ἀργός*, ἡ, ὅν
 6th ed. (as an adjunct. of three terminations, Lob. 105), *πειθός*, *νοσσοί*, *νοσσιά*
(νεοσσοί νεοσσιά, Thom. M. 626; Lob. 206 f.), *πετάομαι* (*πέτομαι*, Lob. 581),
ἀπελπίζειν (*ἀπογνώσκω*), *ἐξυπνίζειν* (*ἀφνιπνίζειν*, Lob. 224), *ραντίζειν* (*ράνιειν*),
δεκατοῦν (*δεκατεύειν*), *ἀροτριᾶν* (*ἀροῦν*, Lob. 254 sq.), *βιβλαρίδιον** (*βιβλίδιον*,
βιβλιδάριον), *ψιχίον* (*ψίξ*), *ταμείον* (*ταμείον*) Lob. 493, *καταποντίζειν* (*κατα-
 ποντοῦν*, Lob. 361), *παραφρονία* (*παραφροσύνη*)*, *πτύον* (*πτέον*, Lob. 321),
ψιθυριστής (for *ψιθυρός*) Thom. M. 927, *ὑτάριον* (as most of the diminutives
 in -*ριον*, e.g. *παιδάριον*, *δνάριον*, Fr. Mr. p. 638). Purely Alexandrian
 (LXX.) are *ἀκρόβυστος* and *ἀκροβυστία*, Fr. Rom. I. 136; verbal forms
 in *ω* pure, instead of in *μ*, e.g. *ὀμνῶ* for *ὀμνυμι*, Thom. M. 648. Cf. also
ξυράω for *ξυρέω*, Thom. M. 642; Phot. Lex. 313 (Lob. 205, and ad Soph.
 Aiac. p. 181), pres. *βαρέω* (*βαρύνω*) Thom. M. p. 142, *σαροῦν* for *σαίρειν*
 Lob. 83, *χολᾶν* (*χολοῦσθαι*), *ἐξὸν εἶναι* for *ἐξείναι* (Foertsch, de locis Lysiae,
 p. 60 sq.). Active forms were adopted instead of the middle or deponent
 verbs usual in the earlier language; as, *φρονάσσειν* Act. iv. 25, from Ps. ii.,
ἀγαλλιᾶν Luke i. 47, *εὐαγγελίζειν* Lob. 269. Compound verbs, in which

¹ Similar to which is *ἱερίσσα* from *ἱερεύς*, which is found in Papyr. Taurin. 9, 14. Cf. Sturz, p. 173.

the preposition did not add to the meaning, were preferred to the less imposing and less sonorous simple forms.¹ Further, as even many compound verbs did not seem expressive enough, numerous double compounds made their appearance (Siebelis, *Pr. de verb. compos. quae quatuor partibus* 38 constant. Budiss. 1832. 4to.). For members of the human body, however, forms originally diminutive became sometimes the current forms in colloquial speech; as, *ὠτίον*, cf. Fischer, *proluss.* p. 10 sqq.; Lob. 211 sq., *φορτίον*.² Lastly, many substantives received a different gender and in 25 part a corresponding change of termination; see § 8 note, and § 9 note 2. 7th ed.

e. Entirely new words and phrases³ were constructed, mainly by composition and for the most part to meet some sensible want; as, *ἀλλοτριωπισκόπος**, *ἀνθρωπάρεσκος* (Lob. 621), *ὀλόκληρος*, *ἀγενεαλόγητος**, *αἵματεκχυσία**, *δικαιοκρισία*, *σιτομέτριον*, *νυχθήμερον* (Sturz, 186), *πληροφορία* (Theophan. 132), *καλοποιεῖν* (Lob. 199 sqq.), *αἰχμαλωτίζειν* and *αἰχμαλωτεύειν* (for *αἰχμάλωτον ποιεῖν*, Thom. M. p. 23; Lob. 442), *μεσιτεύειν*, *γυμνητεύειν*, *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* (*ἀγαθοεργεῖν*) for *ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖν* (Lob. 290), *ἀγαλλίασις*, *ὁρροθεσία*, 24 *ἀντίλιντρον**, *ἐκμυκτηρίζειν**, *ἀλεκτοροφωνία* (Lob. 229), *ἀποκεφαλίζειν* (Lob. 341), *ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι* (*Æsop.* 272 de Fur.), *ἐξουθενεῖν* (Lob. 182; Schäf. ind. *Æsop.* p. 135), *ἐκκακεῖν** (the literary Greek knows only *ἐγκακεῖν*, see my Comment. ad Gal. p. 134, and Mey. on 2 Cor. iv. 1), *εὐδοκεῖν* (Sturz, p. 168; Fr. Rom. II. 370 sq.), *ὁμοιάζειν**, *ἀγαθουργεῖν*, *ἀγαθωσύνη*, *διασκορπίζειν* (Lob. 228), *στηρνῖάν* (*τρυφάν*, Lob. 381), *ἐγκρατεῦμαι** (Lob. 442), *οἰκοδεσπότης*, *οἰκοδεσποτεῖν* (Lob. 373), *λιθοβολεῖν*, *προσφάγιον* (*ὄψον*, Sturz, 191), *λογία*, *κράββατος* (*σκίμπος*, Lob. 63; Sturz, 175 sq.), *πεποιθήσις* (Lob. 295), *σπίλος* (*κηλὶς*, Lob. 28), *μάμμη* (*τήθη*, Lob. 133 sq.), *ράφῆς* (*βελόνη*, Lob. 90), *ἀργίλειαιος* (*κότινος*, Moeris, p. 68), *ἀγνότης**, *ἀγιώτης**, *ἐπενδύτης*, *ἐκτενῶς* and *ἐκτένεια* (Lob. 311), *ἀπαράβατος* (Lob. 313).

It belongs alike to d. and e. to remark that the later Greek especially abounded:—in substantives in *μα*, e.g. *κατάλυμα*, *ἀνταπόδομα*, *κατόρθωμα*, *ράπισμα*, *γέννημα*, *ἐκτρωμα* (Lob. 209), *βάπτισμα**, *ἐνταλμα*, *ιεροσύλημα** (see Pasor, *Gramm. N.T.* pp. 571–574);—in substantives compounded with *συν*, e.g. *συμμαθητής*, *συμπολίτης* (Lob. 471);—in adjectives in *ινος*, e.g. *ὀρθρινός*

¹ That, on the other hand, simple verbs were in later Greek preferred to the corresponding compound, *τίψ* (*Stud. und Krit.* 1842. S. 505) tries to prove from the expression *βουλὴν τιθέναι*, for which the earlier Greeks had used *βουλήν προτιθέναι*. But these phrases may have differed in meaning, see *Raphel* on Acts xxvii. 12. With greater probability might be adduced here the verbs (mentioned under e.) *δειγματίζειν* and *θεατρίζειν*, for which in the written language we find only *παράδειγματίζειν* and *ἐκθεατρίζειν*; so also *ταρταροῦν* for *καταταρταροῦν*. In the same way the Prussian official style employs *Führung* for *Aufführung*.

² It may be mentioned here also, that abbreviated forms of proper names, which probably were current earlier in popular speech, made their way into the written language; as, *Ἀλεξᾶς*, *Σπανία* (for *Ἰσπανία*), etc. The derivatives of *δέχεσθαι* were but slightly altered; as, *πανδοχεύς*, *ξενοδοχεύς*, for *πανδοκεύς*, etc., Lob. 307.

³ Many such words have been collected from the Fathers by *Suicer* in his *sacrae observatt.* (Tigur. 1665, 4to.) p. 311 sqq.

(Sturz, p. 186), *πρωίνος, καθημερινός, δοτράκινος, δερμάτινος* (Lob. 51 sq.), — in verbs in *ω, ιζω, αζω*, e.g. *ἀνακαινώ, δυναμόω, ἀφνπνώ, δολιόω, ἐξουθενώ**, *σθενώ, ὀρβρίζω**, *δειγματίζω**, *θεατρίζω, φυλακίζω**, *ιματίζω, ἀκουτίζω, πελεκίζω* 89 (Lob. 341), *αἰρετίζω* (Babr. f. 61; Boisson. anecd. II. 318), *σινιάζω*. To these may be added also the presents formed from preterites *στήκω* (see above), *γρηγορῶ* Lob. 118 sq. Cf. also such adverbs as *πάντοτε* (*διαπαντός, ἐκάστοτε*), *παιδιόθεν* (*ἐκ παιδίου*, Lob. 93), *καθώς* (Sturz, p. 74), *πανοικί* (*πανοικία, πανοικισίς*, Lob. 515), see Sturz, 187 sq.¹ *Ἐσχάτως ἔχειν* is a 26 later phrase (for *κακῶς, πονηρῶς ἔχειν*) Lob. 389; and *καλοποιεῖν* (see above) 7th ed. was used for the more ancient phrase *καλῶς ποιεῖν*.

It cannot be denied that the preceding list contains many words formed, agreeably to the prevailing analogy of the time, by the Greek-speaking Jews, or even by the N. T. writers themselves (especially Paul, Luke, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Origen. orat. § 27); cf. particularly *ὀρβρίζω* (ⲡⲣⲓⲛ), *λιθοβολεῖν, αἵματεκχυσία, σκληροκαρδία, σκληροτραχίλος, ἀγαθοεργεῖν, ὀρθοποδεῖν, ὀρθοτομεῖν, μοσχοποιεῖν, μεγαλωσύνη, ταπεινοφροσύνη, παραβάτης, πατριάρχης, ἀγενεαλόγητος, ὑποπόδιον* (Sturz, 199), 25 *χρυσοδακτύλιος*. However, the circumstance that no traces of these words 6th ed. are to be found in the Greek writers still extant of the first centuries after Christ (but these have not yet been fully explored)² must not be regarded as altogether decisive. Many of the words in question may have been already current in the popular speech of the Greeks. But words denoting Jewish institutions, or heathenism as idolatry, originated of course among the Greek-speaking Jews themselves; such as, *σκηνοπηγία, εἰδωλόθυτον, εἰδωλολατρεία*. Lastly, many words assumed among the Jews a peculiar meaning resting on special Jewish modes of thought; as, *ἐπιστρέφειν, ἐπιστροφή*, absolutely used, *to convert, conversion, προσήλυτος, πεντεκοστή* *Whitsuntide, κόσμος* (in a figurative sense), *φυλακτήριον, ἐπιγαμβρεῖν* of the levirate marriage. In reference to Christian apostolic words and forms (such as *βάπτισμα*) see § 3 end, p. 35.

2. GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES: These are confined mostly to *inflections of nouns and verbs*, which were either unknown in the earlier language, or not used in certain words, or at least foreign to the literary Attic: for in this respect also the intermixture of dialects previously distinct became manifest. Moreover, the use of the Dual became rare.

¹ Popular Greek naturally adopted single foreign words (appellatives), with slight alterations, from the languages in use in the different provinces along with the Greek. On this, however, we cannot dwell in an inquiry so general as the above. With regard to the Egyptian element in the Septuagint and elsewhere, see Sturz, dialect. Alex. p. 84 sqq. Also Latin and Persian words and expressions have been pointed out in the N. T.; cf. *Olear.* de stylo N. T. p. 366 sq. 368 sqq.; *Georgi*, Hierocrit. I. p. 247 sqq. and the whole of II. (de latinismis N. T.). Cf. *Dresig*, de N. T. gr. latinismis merito et falso suspectis. Lips. 1726, 4to., and *Schleiermacher*, Hermeneutik, S. 62 f.

² Most of this description appear subsequently in the Byzantine authors, who abound in double compounds and lengthened forms of words. What had fallen into disuse eagerly restored and revived.

The later Greek has few *syntactical* peculiarities. Certain verbs, for instance, are construed with cases different from those they formerly used 40 to govern (§ 31, 1. cf. Boissonade, anecd. III. 136, 154); conjunctions which previously took only the Subjunct. or Optat. are used with the Indic.; the use of the Optat., particularly in the oratio obliqua, decreases sensibly; the use of the future participle after verbs of going, sending, etc., recedes before that of the present (or the infinitive); Active verbs with *ἐαυτόν* begin to be substituted for Middle, when unemphatic. Also, in general, more forcible expressions lose their emphasis. On the other hand, additional expressiveness is aimed at even by grammatical forms, cf. *μειζότερος*, *ἵνα* instead of the Infinitive, etc. But the later varieties of inflection will most appropriately find place in § 4.

Later popular Greek had, beyond doubt, different peculiarities in different provinces. Critics, accordingly, have professed to discover Cilicisms in the style of Paul (Hieron. ad Algasiam quaest. 10. Tom. IV. ed. Marti- 27 anay, p. 204). The four examples, however, which this Father adduces 7th ed. are not conclusive (Michaelis, Einl. ins N. T. 1 Thl. S. 161); and as we know nothing respecting the provincialisms of Cilicia (see, however, Sturz, Dial. Alex. p. 62), it is better at present to dismiss the investigation altogether, than to rest it on empty conjectures. Cf. B. Stolberg, de Cilicisms a Paulo usurpatis, in his tr. de solocismis N. T. p. 91 sqq.

§ 3. HEBREW-ARAMAIC TINGE OF THE N. T. DICTION.

26
6th ed.

This popular variety of Greek, however, was not spoken and written by the Jews without foreign admixture. They not only imparted to their Greek style the general complexion of their mother tongue, which consists in vividness and circumstantiality as well as uniformity of expression, but also introduced particular Jewish turns of expression. Yet both these peculiarities are more apparent in their translations directly from Hebrew, than in their original composition in Greek.¹

Lexical Hebraisms (and Aramaisms) are more numerous than grammatical; and consist partly in the extension of the signification of words, partly in the imitation of entire phrases, and partly also in the analogous formation of new words to express corresponding Hebrew terms. Thus originated a Jewish-Greek, which native Greeks did not entirely understand,² and which they even 41 sometimes turned into ridicule.

¹ Herein lies an argument, which has received little attention, why the text of the N. T. is not to be regarded as a translation from the Aramaic, and that too, in a great measure, clumsily executed.

² Though the opinion of *L. de Dieu* (præfat. ad grammat. orient.): facilius Euro-

- All the nations which after the death of Alexander continued under Graeco-Macedonian rule and which gradually adopted the Greek language of their conquerors even in common life, particularly the Syrians and Hebrews, spoke Greek less purely than native Greeks, and imparted to it more or less the impress of their mother tongue (*Salmas. de lingua Hellen. p. 121, cf. Joseph. antt. 20, 9*).¹ As the Greek-speaking Jews are usually denominated Hellenists, this Oriental variety of Greek, known to us only in the writings of Jews, has not improperly obtained the name of the Hellenistic idiom; see *Buttm. I. S. 6*.² Accordingly, the diction of the LXX. and of the N. T. (of the Pseudepigrapha of the O. T. and the Apocrypha of the N. T.) has been especially called Hellenistic; yet it was not *Drusius* (*ad Act. vi. 6*), but *Scaliger* (*animad. in Euseb. p. 134*), who first employed this term.
- The Hebraisms of the N. T. — for these only, and not the oriental cast of the periods and arrangement of words, were usually attended to — have been collected frequently and thoroughly; in particular by *Vorst*, *Leusden* (in his *Philol. hebr.*, from which the *dissertatio de dialectis N. T. sing. de ejus hebraismis* was separately printed by *J. F. Fischer*, *Lips. 1754*,

paeis foret Platonis Aristotelisque elegantiam imitari, quam Platoni Aristotelive N. T. nobis interpretari, is decidedly an exaggeration. Still, the circumstance mentioned above may in general explain the fact that learned Greek transcribers, or possessors of MSS. of the N. T., often took the liberty of making corrections in order to bring the diction nearer to Grecian elegance; see Hug, Einl. ins N. T. I. S. 129.

¹ It is well known that Greek subsequently became *Latinized*, also, when the Romans began to write in that language. The Latin coloring, however, is not very marked before the Byzantine literature, even in Greek translations from Latin authors, such as that of *Eutropius* by *Paeanius*, of *Cicero's Cat. Maj. and Somn. Scip.* by *Theodorus* (published by *Götz. Nürnberg. 1801. 8vo.*). This was partly owing to the much closer affinity between Greek and Latin than between Hebrew and Greek, and partly because these authors had made Greek a special study.

² This appellation ought to be resumed as a technical term, it is so thoroughly appropriate. For *ἑλληνιστής* in the N. T. (*Acts vi. 1*) denotes a Greek-speaking Jew; (for compilations respecting *ἑλληνίζειν* rather than *ἑλληνιστής*, see *Wetstein II. p. 490; Lob. p. 379 sq.*). The notion of *Salmasius*, that in the N. T. *Hellenist* means a Greek proselyte to Judaism, is a rash conclusion from *Acts vi. 5*, and *Eichstädt* (*ad Mori acroas. herm. I. p. 227*) should not have adopted it. Moreover, the controversy between *Dn. Heinsius* (*exercit. de lingua hellenist. L. B. 1643. 8vo.*), and *Salmasius* (*hellenistica L. B. 1643. 8vo.; funus linguae hellen. ib. 1643. 8vo.; ossilegium linguae hellen. ib. 1643. 8vo.*), on the appellation *dialectus hellenistica*, related not merely to the word *Hellenistic*, but still more to the term *dialectus*, for which *Salmasius* wished to substitute *character* or *stylus idioticus* (*de Hellenist. p. 250*), compare also *Tittmann*, *Synonym. I. p. 259 sq.* Yet the term *dialect* (*διὰλεκτος τοιαύτη*) might be allowable to denote, particularly in accordance with the very extensive meaning of the verb *διαλέγεσθαι* (see, e.g. *Strabo 8, 514*), that variety of Greek spoken by Hellenistic Jews. Other dissertations on the designation *dialect. hellenist.* see in *Walch*, *bib. theol. IV. p. 278 sq.* and *Fabric. biblioth. graec. ed. Harles. IV. p. 893 sq.* *Thiersch* and *Rost* have begun to call the language of the Greek Bible the *ecclesiastical dialect*. This, however, is too narrow for the subject discussed above, and the word *dialect* is inappropriate.

1792, 8vo.), and Olearius (de Stylo N. T. p. 232 sqq.), cf. also Hartmann, linguist. Einl. in das Stud. d. A. T. S. 382 ff. Anm. Still, this matter ought to have been executed with more critical precision.¹ Nearly all who have written on this subject hitherto, are chargeable, more or less, with the following errors :

a. They did not give sufficient attention to the Aramaic elements in the diction of the N. T.² In the time of Christ, as all know, the popular speech of the Jews in Palestine was not the old Hebrew, but Syro-Chaldaic; accordingly, many of the most current expressions of common life³ must have been introduced into Jewish-Greek from this dialect. Among the older writers Olearius has a special section de Chaldaeo-Syriasmis N. T. p. 345 sqq. (cf. Georgi, Hierocrit. I. p. 187 sqq.). More recently, a great deal relating to this subject has been collected by Boysen (krit. Erläuterungen des Grundtextes d. N. T. aus der syrischen Uebersetzung. Quedlinb. 1761, 8vo., 3 Stücke), Agrell (oratio de dictione N. T. Wexion. 1798, and otiola Syriaca. Lund. 1816, 4to. pp. 53-58), and Hartmann (as above, 382 ff.). Already had several earlier commentators occasionally directed attention to Aramaisms; see Michaelis, Einleit. ins N. T. 1 Thl. S. 138 ff.; Fischer ad Leusden, p. 140; Bertholdt's Einleit. 1 Thl. S. 158. — Under this head come also the (few) Rabbinisms (see Olear. l. c. p. 360 sqq.; Georgi l. c. p. 221 sqq.), for the elucidation of which much may still be derived from Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. They are mostly terms that may have been used in the Rabbinical schools as early as the time of Christ.

b. They overlooked almost entirely the difference in style of the several writers; so that according to their collections all the books of the N. T. appear to abound in Hebraisms to the same extent. But in this particular no little dissimilarity exists, and Matthew, Luke, John, Paul, James, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews ought by no means to be thrown together promiscuously.⁴ Those learned collectors failed also

¹ A new and complete treatise on the Hebraisms of the N. T., elaborated critically and on rational principles, is certainly needed. Meanwhile, the commencement recently made (*D. E. F. Bockel*, de hebraismis N. T. Spec. 1. Lips. 1840, 8vo.) deserves to be gratefully recognized.

² Many of the peculiarities pointed out by the Hebraists might with equal propriety be called either Hebraisms or Syriasmis: e.g. *el* for an indefinite article, and the frequent use of participles with *elva* for a finite verb. It is preferable, however, to regard these and the like as Aramaisms, since they are far more common and more distinctly established in the Aramaic, and occur almost exclusively in those later Hebrew writings the style of which approaches the Aramaic. This refers principally to the diction of the N. T., for the Septuagint exhibits but few Aramaisms. Cf. *Olear.* p. 308; *Gesen.* Com. zu Jes. I. 63.

³ To these the Aramaisms of the N. T. are, essentially, confined. For the religious expressions are to be connected (through the medium of the Sept. in the case of the majority of extra-Palestinean Jews) with the Ancient Hebrew, the sacred language. To the same class also belongs *edvaros*, pestilence, Rev. vi. 8; xviii. 8 (אָפֶטֶס, אֶפְדָּה); cf. *Ewald*, Com. in Apoc. p. 122.

⁴ Even in one and the same writer we find a want of uniformity. Thus Luke in his

to show the relation between the diction of the N. T. and that of the Septuagint; though, great as the resemblance is, considerable dissimilarity exists, and, speaking generally, the style of the LXX. as a direct and in part a literal translation of the Hebrew text is more Hebraistic than that of the N. T.

c. They included in their list of Hebraisms many expressions which are not unknown to the Greek prose writers, or are the common property of many languages; and, in general, they were guided by no distinct notion of what constitutes a Hebraism; see Tittmann, *de causis contortar. interpretatt.* N. T. p. 18 sq. (Synonym. I. p. 269 sqq.); de Wette in the *A. L. Z.* 1816. N. 39. S. 306.

They made a threefold use of the term Hebraism, viz. to designate

1. Such words, phrases, and constructions, as are peculiar to the Hebrew (Aramaean) tongue, and to which there is nothing corresponding in Greek prose; e.g. *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι, ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι, πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, οἰκοδομῆν* (in a figurative sense), *πλατύνειν τὴν καρδίαν, πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω, οὐ πᾶς* (for *οὐδεὶς*), *ἐξομολογεῖσθαί τινι* and *ἐν τινι*, etc.
2. Such words, etc. as, though occasionally occurring in Greek authors, are imitated by the writers of the N. T. directly from their native tongue; e.g. *σπέρμα* for *proles* (Schwarz, *Comm.* p. 1235) hebr. פֶּרֶץ; *ἀνάγκη* *distress, calamity* (cf. D. Sic. 4, 43; Schwarz, as above, p. 81) hebr. צָרָה, צָרָה, צָרָה; *ἐρωτᾶν request* (as *ἵνα* denotes both *request* and *interrogate*, cf. the Latin *rogare*) Babr. 97, 3; Apollon. synt. p. 289; *εἰς ἀπάντησιν* (D. Sic. 8, 59; Polyb. 5, 26, 8) cf. פָּנֵי כָּל; *πέρατα τῆς γῆς* (Thuc. 1, 69; Xen. Ages. 9, 4; Dio Chr. 62. 587) cf. גְּבֻלַּת עֲרֵב; *χείλος* for *littus* (Her. 1, 191; Strabo, and others) cf. קַיִשׁ; *στόμα* of a *sword* (קַיִשׁ) cf., besides the Poets, Philostrate. her. 19, 4. So also the expression *ἐνδύσασθαι Χριστόν* (Ταρκύνιον ἐνδύσ. in Dion. H.), formed after פָּנֵי כָּל, etc. Cf. above, p. 17.
3. Such words, etc., as are equally common in Greek and in Hebrew, and with regard to which, accordingly, there is room for doubt whether they are to be considered as portions of the popular Greek adopted by the Jews, or as currently employed by them through the influence of their native tongue; e.g. *φυλάσσει νόμον, αἷμα caedes, ἀνὴρ* joined to an appellative (*ἀνὴρ φονεύς*), *παῖς slave, μεγαλύνειν to praise, διώκειν to pursue, (cultivate) a virtue*. To this head may be referred many of the grammatical illustrations contained in Haab's grammar.
4. Lastly, it cannot be denied that in a great many passages expositors introduced imaginary Hebraisms (Aramaisms); as, Eph. v. 26, *ἐν ῥήματι ἵνα* אֲשֶׁר אֶלֶּיךָ (see Koppe); Matt. xxv. 23, *χαρά convivium* from Aram.

Gospel, where he had to follow the evangelical *paradoxis*, hebraizes more than in the Acts; the deterioration in the diction after the proem of the Gospel was long ago pointed out. The hymns, also, and the speeches, have more of a Hebrew coloring than the narrative part; cf. e.g. Luke i. 13-20, 42-55, 68-79. The linguistic relation of Luke to the Synoptics has not yet been systematically exhibited.

מִתְּרָא (see Fischer, ad Leusden dial. p. 52) or Hebr. מִתְּרָא, Esth. ix. 17, etc. (Eichhorn, Einl. ins N. T. I. 528); Matt. vi. 1, δακισσίνη *alms* from Chald. מִתְּרָא; Matt. xxi. 13, ληστὰι *traders* (Fischer, ad Leusden dial. p. 48); and during the process many a misuse of the Sept. crept in (as Luke xi. 22, σκῦλα *supellex*, cf. Esth. iii. 13; Acts ii. 24, ὁδοὺς *vinctula*, cf. Ps. xviii. 6). And to crown all, πῆραν *on this side*, like עָרָא (?)! Cf. also Fr. Rom. I. 367.¹

It is obvious from what has been said that there are two kinds of Hebraisms in the N. T., one of which may be called *perfect*, and the other *imperfect*. By *perfect* Hebraisms we mean those words, phrases, and constructions which are strictly peculiar to the Hebrew (Aramaean) language, and therefore were transferred directly thence into the Hellenistic idiom, (the diction of the N. T.).² On the other hand, we call *imperfect* Hebraisms 31 all words, phrases, and constructions which, though to be found also in 7th ed. Greek prose authors, are in all probability introduced directly from the Hebrew (Aramaean): first, because the N. T. writers were more familiar with Aramaean than with Greek; and secondly, because the phraseology in question was of more frequent occurrence in the former language than in the latter. De Wette also perceived this distinction, and stated it as follows (as above, S. 319): "Certainly it makes an essential difference whether a form of speech is wholly foreign to the Greek, or, on the other hand, finds in Greek a point of contact to which it can attach itself."

This whole investigation must be carried farther back; and first of all the *origin* of the so-called Hebraisms must be considered. In doing this, however, we cannot take the LXX.³ as our basis, since they, as translators, 30 furnish no sure testimony respecting that Greek diction of the Jews which 6th ed. was formed *independently* and by oral intercourse. Nor can we immediately use for this purpose the doctrinal parts of the N. T., as the *religious* phraseology of the Jews in Greek was naturally a close imitation of the Hebrew, and formed on the model of the Septuagint. But it is pre-eminently from the narrative style of the Apocrypha, the Gospels, and the Acts, that the influence of Hebrew on the Greek of Jews is to be most clearly determined.

In the first place, it is plain that original writers, scarcely less than 45 translators, unconsciously gave their Greek style the *general* impress of the Hebrew-Aramaic idiom, from the influence of which, as their mother

¹ In the title of *Kaiser's* dissertation de linguae aramaicae usu cet. Norimb. 1831. 8vo. the word *abusus* would be nearer the truth.

² *Blessig's* definition is: Hebraismus est solius hebraei sermonis propria loquendi ratio, cujusmodi in graecam vel aliam linguam sine barbarismi suspicione transferre non licet.

³ The most important work that has yet appeared on the linguistic element of the Septuagint, is *H. W. Jos. Thiersch*, de Pentateuchi versione alex. libb. 3. Erlang. 1840. 8vo., from which I have obtained many acceptable illustrations for the later editions of this Grammar. But a complete exhibition of the diction of the Septuagint is very much needed.

tongue, they could not rid themselves without great attention and long practice. This *general* impress consists, partly in explicitness (hence the use of prepositions with cases instead of cases alone, the latter construction implying more abstraction), and a predilection for circumstantiality (φεύγειν ἀπὸ προσώπου τινός, ἐγράφη διὰ χειρός τ., πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου, καὶ ἔσται — καὶ ἐκχεῖ, and the like; the frequent use of the pers. and dem. pron. particularly after the relative, the narrative expression καὶ ἐγένετο, etc.); partly in the simplicity, and even monotony, with which the Hebrew (agreeably to a co-ordinating, rather than subordinating principle) constructs periods, and links clause to clause. Hence the sparing use of conjunctions in Jewish-Greek (in which respect the classic authors display so copious a variety); hence the uniformity in the use of the tenses; hence the absence of periodic combination of several subordinate clauses 32 into a single sentence, and, in connection with this, the scanty use of participial constructions, so frequent and so diversified among the Greeks.

In narration, a further prominent peculiarity of Hebrew-Greek consists in this, that the words of another are almost always quoted directly; whereas the indirect introduction of quotations gives a distinctive cast to the Greek historical style, and occasions particularly the diversified use of the Optative, a mood almost unknown in the Greek writings of Jews.

From this *general* Jewish influence alone the Greek of the Jews must have received a strongly marked character; but in *particulars* it received a great additional influence, and it is these particulars which are usually styled Hebraisms.

a. Attaching the derivative meanings of a vernacular word to that foreign word which corresponds to it in primary signification was the simplest mode of Hebraizing (cf. ἐρωτᾶν בָּרַךְ to *interrogate* and to *request*). Hence it would not be strange if the Jews had used δικαιοσύνη for *alms*, according to the use of צדקה. Less dubious instances are ὀφειλῆμα *pec-* 31 *catum*, after the Aram. חֵוּב; νύμφη (*bride*) also *daughter-in-law* Matt. x. 35, 6th ed. as ἡὲν denotes both (Sept. Gen. xxxviii. 11); εἰς for *primus* (in certain cases) like הָיָה; ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τινι also *praise one* (thanking), like בָּרַךְ (Ps. cvi. 47; cxvii. 4, and elsewhere in Sept.); εὐλογεῖν *bless*, i.e. make happy, like בָּרַךְ; κτίσις *thing created, creation*, cf. Chald. בְּרִית; δόξα *brightness*, like כְּבוֹד; δυνάμεις *miracles*, כִּשְׁפֵי. The transfer of figurative senses is the most frequent; as, ποτήριον *sors, portio* Matt. xx. 22 (כַּס); σκάνδαλον *stumbling-block* in a moral sense (מַכְשָׁל); γλῶσσα for *nation* (לָשׁוֹן); χεῖλος *for speech* (פֶּה); ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (הֵנָּה יִהְיֶה) *according to God's judgment*; 46 καρδιά εὐθεία (יָשָׁר); περιπατεῖν *walk*, of one's course of life; ὁδός (הַדֶּרֶךְ) cf. Schäf. ind. ad Aesop. p. 148; ἀνάθεμα *not merely what is consecrated to God*, but, agreeably to the Heb. מְרִירָה, *to be destroyed*, Rom. ix. 8, Deut. vii. 26, Josh. vi. 17, and elsewhere; λύειν Matt. xvi. 19 for *declare lawful*, after the Rabbin. פָּטַר.

b. Numerous Hebraisms arose from the verbal translation of certain

very common vernacular expressions; as, *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* for *קָבַץ פָּנֶיךָ*; *ζητεῖν ψυχὴν* for *עָרַב נַפְשָׁא*; *ποιεῖν ἔλεος (χάρυν) μετὰ τινος*, for *עָרַב חַסְדָּא*; *ἀνοίγειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς* or *τὸ στόμα τινός* (*חַסְדָּא*); *γεύεσθαι θανάτου* *מִיתָא* *עָרַב* (Talm.); *ἄρτον φαγεῖν* (*coenare*) for *חָבַל אֶמְלָא*; *αἷμα ἐκχέειν* (*דָּם* *הָפַשׁ*) *kill*; *ἀνίστημι σπέρμα τινί* for *הָיָא נַפְשָׁא*; *υἱὸς θανάτου* for *בְּרִיָּה* (*οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*); *καρπὸς ὀσφύος* for *פְּרִי הַבֶּטֶן*; *καρπὸς κοιλίας* for *פְּרִי הַבֶּטֶן*; *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος τινός* for *אֵרָא מִבֶּטֶן*; *ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός* for *מִבֶּטֶן*; *δφείλημα ἀφιέναι* for *מְחִילָא* (Talm.); also *στηρίζειν πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ* for *מְחִילָא*; *πᾶσα σάρξ* for *בָּשָׂר*.

33
Tib. ed.

c. The formation of foreign derivatives in imitation of vernacular, implies more reflection and contrivance; as, *ὀλοκαύτωμα* (from *ὀλοκαυτοῦν*, Lob. 524) for *חֲבִיב*; *σπλαγγνίζεσθαι* from *σπλάγγνα*, as *חַסְדָּא* is connected with *חֲסִיד*; *σκανδαλίζω, σκανδαλίζεσθαι*, like *בְּשָׂר*, *חֲבִיב*; *ἐγκαινίζω* from *ἐγκαίνια*, as *חֲבִיב* is related to *חֲבִיב*; *ἀναθεματίζω*, like *חֲבִיב*; *δρρρίζω*, like *חֲבִיב*; perhaps *ἐνωτίζεσθαι*, like *חֲבִיב*, cf. Fischer ad Leusden dial. p. 27. *Προσωποληπτύν*, for which even the Hebr. has no single corresponding word, goes still further.

All this easily accounts for the predominant Hebrew-Aramaic complexion of the style of the N. T. writers, who were not, like Philo and Josephus,² acquainted with Greek literature, and did not aim at writing correct Greek. Hence, the whole cast of their composition (particularly the want of compactness, especially in narration) must have offended a cultivated Greek ear; indeed, numerous single expressions must either have conveyed to a native Greek an erroneous meaning, or have been entirely unintelligible (such as *ἀφιέναι ὀφειλήματα*,³ *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*, *λογιζέσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, and the like); cf. Gataker de Stylo N. T. cap. 5. Hence also is explained why such Hebraistic turns of expression are less frequent in the original authors of the N. T. than in the translators of the O. T., and in the *Hellenistic* writers of the N. T. (Paul, Luke, particularly in the

32
Tib. ed.

47

¹ A similar Grecism in Latin is e.g. *a teneris unguiculis* (Cic. fam. 1, 6, 3), which although a Greek phrase was quite intelligible to the Romans, as e.g. *καρπὸς χειλέων*, though it must have had a strange sound, was unquestionably intelligible to the Greeks; cf. *καρπὸς φρενῶν*, Pind. Nem. 10, 22. Still more easily must the Greeks have understood *καρπὸς κοιλίας*, since *fruit*, by itself, (for fruit of the body) was used in unambiguous connections, as well among the Greeks (Arist. polit. 7, 16; Eurip. Bacch. 1305), as elsewhere; cf. *Ruhnken*, ad Homer. in Cerer. 23.

² Though even Josephus, when narrating Old Test. history after the Septuagint, does not always avoid Hebraisms; see *Scharfenberg*, de Josephi et LXX. consensu, in *Pott's* sylloge, VII. p. 306 ff.

³ That is, in the signification of remitting *sins*, so far, therefore, as regards *ὀφειλήματα*. For, *ἀφιέναι* *remit*, even applied to offences, occurs in Her. 6, 30, in the expression *ἀφιέναι αἰτίαν*, and *ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι* *debita* remittere (obligatory acts), is quite common. In later Greek we find *ἀφιέναι τι τὴν ἀδικίαν*, Plutarch, Pomp. 34; see *Coraes* and *Schäff.* in loc. The well-known phrase *ἐβρίσκεν χάριν* would likewise have been understood by a native Greek, though it would have sounded strange to him (instead of *ἐβρίσκεσθαι*).

the same head Eichhorn (Einl. ins N. T. IV. 127) refers the phrase *θέσθαι τι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, employed it is said in solemn style by the poets particularly the tragedians, since it occurs in the N. T. in the plainest prose. But the
 37 Homeric phrase *ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθαι* is only similar, not identical. The expression *συντηρεῖν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, cited by the same author as a solemn formula, is used also in the N. T. as emphatic. *Κοράσιον*, on the other hand, is to be regarded as an example of a word which, dropping its secondary import, was adopted into the literary style from the colloquial (Lob. 74), cf. Germ. *müdel*.

d. Many words which had long been in use received another form or pronunciation, which generally supplanted its predecessor; such as, *μετοικεσία* (*μετοικία*), *ικεσία* (*ικετία*, Lob. 504), *ἀνάθεμα* (*ἀνάθημα*, Schäf. Plutarch. V. p. 11), *ἀνάστημα*, *γενέσια* (*γενέθλια*, Lob. 104), *γλωσσόκομον* (*γλωσσοκομῖον*, Lob. 98 sq.), *ἐκπαλαι* (*πάλαι*, Lob. 45 sq.), *ἐχθές* (*χθές*), *ἐξάπινα* (*ἐξάπινης*), *αἷτημα* (*αἷτησις*), *ψεύσμα* (*ψῆδος*, Sallier ad Th. M. 927), *ἀπάντησις* (*ἀπάντημα*), *ἡγησις* (*ἡγεμονία*), *λυχνία* (*λυχνίον*, Lob. 314), *νίκος* (*νίκη*, Lob. 647), *οἰκοδομή* (*οἰκοδόμησις*, Lob. 490), *ὄνειδισμός*, Lob. 512 (*ὄνειδος*, *ὄνειδισμα*, Her. 2, 133), *ὄπτασία* (*ὄψις*), *ἡ ὀρκωμοσία* (*τὰ ὀρκωμόσια*), *μισθοποδοσία* (*μισθοδοσία*), *συγκυρία* (*συγκύρησις*), *ἀποστασία* (*ἀπόστασις*, Lob. 528), *νουθεσία* (*νουθέτησις*, Lob. 512), *ἀπαρτισμός* (*ἀπάρτισις*), *μελίσσιος* (*μελίσσειος*), *ποταπός* (*ποδαπός*, Lob. 56), *βασίλισσα* (*βασίλεια*),¹ *μοιχαλὶς* (*μοιχάς* Lob. 452), *μονόφθαλμος* (*ἐτερόφθαλμος*, Lob. 136), *καμμύνειν* (*καταμύνειν*, Sturz, p. 123), *ὄψιμος* (*ὄψιος*, Lob. 52), *ὁ πλησίον* (*ὁ πέλας*), *προσήλυτος* (*ἐπηλυς*, Valcken. ad Ammon. p. 32), *φυσιοῦσθαι* (*φυσᾶν*) *to be puffed up* (trop. Babr. 114), *ἀπενίζεω* since Polybius for *ἀπενίζεσθαι* (Passow), *ἐκχύνειν* (*ἐκχέειν*, Lob. 726), *στήκω* (from *ἔστηκα stand*, Bttm. II. 36), *ἀργός*, *ἡ, ὃν*
 24 7th ed. (as an adjunct. of three terminations, Lob. 105), *πειθός*, *νοσοῖ*, *νοσσιᾷ* (*νεοσσοῖ*, *νεοσσιᾷ*, Thom. M. 626; Lob. 206 f.), *πετάομαι* (*πέτομαι*, Lob. 581), *ἀπελπίζειν* (*ἀπογνώσκειν*), *ἐξυπνίζειν* (*ἀφνπνίζειν*, Lob. 224), *ραντίζειν* (*ραίνειν*), *δεκατοῦν* (*δεκατεύειν*), *ἀροτριᾶν* (*ἀροῦν*, Lob. 254 sq.), *βιβλαριδιον** (*βιβλιδιον*, *βιβλιδάριον*), *ψυχίον* (*ψίξ*), *ταμείον* (*ταμείον*) Lob. 493, *καταποντίζειν* (*καταποντοῦν*, Lob. 361), *παραφρονία* (*παραφροσύνη**), *πτύον* (*πτέον*, Lob. 321), *ψιθυριστής* (for *ψιθυρός*) Thom. M. 927, *ῥάριον* (as most of the diminutives in *-αριον*, e.g. *παιδάριον*, *ὄνάριον*, Fr. Mr. p. 638). Purely Alexandrian (LXX.) are *ἀκρόβυστος* and *ἀκροβυστία*, Fr. Rom. I. 136; verbal forms in *ω* pure, instead of in *μ*, e.g. *ὀμνῶ* for *ὀμνυμι*, Thom. M. 648. Cf. also *ἐνράω* for *ἐνρέω*, Thom. M. 642; Phot. Lex. 313 (Lob. 205, and ad Soph. Aiac. p. 181), pres. *βαρέω* (*βαρύνω*) Thom. M. p. 142, *σαροῦν* for *σαίρειν* Lob. 83, *χολᾶν* (*χολοῦσθαι*), *ἐξὸν εἶναι* for *ἐξείναι* (Foertsch, de locis Lysiae, p. 60 sq.). Active forms were adopted instead of the middle or deponent verbs usual in the earlier language; as, *φρονάσσειν* Act. iv. 25, from Ps. ii., *ἀγαλλιᾶν* Luke i. 47, *εὐαγγελίζεω* Lob. 269. Compound verbs in which

¹ Similar to which is *ιέρισσα* from *ιερεῦς*, which is found in Papyr. Taurin. 9, 14. Cf. Sturz, p. 173.

the preposition did not add to the meaning, were preferred to the less imposing and less sonorous simple forms.¹ Further, as even many compound verbs did not seem expressive enough, numerous double compounds made their appearance (Siebelis, *Pr. de verb. compos. quæ quatuor partibus* 38 constant. Budias. 1832. 4to.). For members of the human body, however, forms originally diminutive became sometimes the current forms in colloquial speech; as, *ὠτίον*, cf. Fischer, *proluss.* p. 10 sqq.; Lob. 211 sq., *φορτίον*.² Lastly, many substantives received a different gender and in 25 part a corresponding change of termination; see § 8 note, and § 9 note 2. 7th ed.

e. Entirely new words and phrases³ were constructed, mainly by composition and for the most part to meet some sensible want; as, *ἀλλοτριοπισκόπος**, *ἀνθρωπάρεσκος* (Lob. 621), *ὀλόκληρος*, *ἀγενεαλόγητος**, *αἵματεκχυσία**, *δικαιοκρισία*, *σιτομέτριον*, *νυχήμερον* (Sturz, 186), *πληροφορία* (Theophan. 132), *καλοποιεῖν* (Lob. 199 sqq.), *αἰχμαλωτίζειν* and *αἰχμαλωτεύειν* (for *αἰχμάλωτον ποιεῖν*, Thom. M. p. 23; Lob. 442), *μεσιτεύειν*, *γυμνητεύειν*, *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* (*ἀγαθοεργεῖν*) for *ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖν* (Lob. 290), *ἀγαλλίασις*, *ὀρθοεσία*, 24 *ἀντίλυτρον**, *ἐκμυκτηρίζειν**, *ἀλεκτοροφωνία* (Lob. 229), *ἀποκεφαλίζειν* (Lob. 341), *ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι* (*Æsop.* 272 de Fur.), *ἐξουθενεῖν* (Lob. 182; Schäf. ind. *Æsop.* p. 135), *ἐκκακεῖν** (the literary Greek knows only *ἐγκακεῖν*, see my Comment. ad Gal. p. 134, and Mey. on 2 Cor. iv. 1), *εὐδοκεῖν* (Sturz, p. 168; Fr. Rom. II. 370 sq.), *ὁμοιάζειν**, *ἀγαθουργεῖν*, *ἀγαθωσύνη*, *διασκορπίζειν* (Lob. 228), *στηρηνῶν* (*τρυφᾶν*, Lob. 381), *ἐγκρατεύομαι** (Lob. 442), *οἰκοδεσπότης*, *οἰκοδεσποτεῖν* (Lob. 373), *λυθοβολεῖν*, *προσφάγιον* (*ὄψον*, Sturz, 191), *λογία*, *κράββατος* (*σκήμπους*, Lob. 63; Sturz, 175 sq.), *πεποιθήσις* (Lob. 295), *σπίλος* (*κηλὶς*, Lob. 28), *μάμμη* (*τήθη*, Lob. 133 sq.), *ραφίς* (*βελόνη*, Lob. 90), *ἀγρίελαος* (*κότινος*, Moeris, p. 68), *ἀγνότης**, *ἀγιότης**, *ἐπενδύτης*, *ἐκτενῶς* and *ἐκτένεια* (Lob. 311), *ἀπαράβατος* (Lob. 313).

It belongs alike to d. and e. to remark that the later Greek especially abounded:—in substantives in *μα*, e.g. *κατάλυμα*, *ἀνταπόδομα*, *κατόρθωμα*, *ράπισμα*, *γέννημα*, *ἐκτρωμα* (Lob. 209), *βάπτισμα**, *ἔνταλμα*, *ιεροσύλημα** (see Pasor, *Gramm. N.T.* pp. 571–574);—in substantives compounded with *συν*, e.g. *συμμαθητής*, *συμπολίτης* (Lob. 471);—in adjectives in *ινος*, e.g. *ὀρθρινός*

¹ That, on the other hand, simple verbs were in later Greek preferred to the corresponding compound, *Tüf.* (Stud. und Krit. 1842. S. 505) tries to prove from the expression *βουλήν τιθέναι*, for which the earlier Greeks had used *βουλήν προτιθέναι*. But these phrases may have differed in meaning, see *Ruphel* on Acts xxvii. 12. With greater probability might be adduced here the verbs (mentioned under e.) *δειγματίζειν* and *θεατρίζειν*, for which in the written language we find only *παραδειγματίζειν* and *ἐκθεατρίζειν*; so also *ταρταροῦν* for *καταταρταροῦν*. In the same way the Prussian official style employs *Führung* for *Aufführung*.

² It may be mentioned here also, that abbreviated forms of proper names, which probably were current earlier in popular speech, made their way into the written language; as, *Ἀλεξᾶς*, *Σπανία* (for *Ἰσπανία*), etc. The derivatives of *δέχεσθαι* were but slightly altered; as, *πανδοχεύς*, *ξενοδοχεύς*, for *πανδοκεύς*, etc., Lob. 307.

³ Many such words have been collected from the Fathers by *Suicer* in his *sacrae observatt.* (Tigur. 1665, 4to.) p. 311 sqq.

(Sturz, p. 186), *πρωίνος, καθημερινός, δοτράκινος, δερμάτινος* (Lob. 51 sq.), — in verbs in *ω, ιζω, αζω*, e.g. *ἀνακαινώ, δυναμών, ἀφντνών, δολιών, ἐξουθενών**, *σθενών, ὀρθρίζω*, δειγματίζω*, θεατρίζω, φυλακίζω*, ἱματίζω, ἀκουτίζω, πελεκίζω* 39 (Lob. 341), *αἰρετίζω* (Babr. f. 61; Boisson. anecd. II. 318), *σινιάζω*. To these may be added also the presents formed from preterites *στήκω* (see above), *γρηγορῶ* Lob. 118 sq. Cf. also such adverbs as *πάντοτε* (*διαπαντός, ἐκάστοτε*), *παιδιόθεν* (*ἐκ παιδίου*, Lob. 93), *καθώς* (Sturz, p. 74), *πανοικί* (*πανοικία, πανοικισίς*, Lob. 515), see Sturz, 187 sq.¹ *Ἐσχάτως ἔχειν* is a 26 later phrase (for *κακῶς, πονηρῶς ἔχειν*) Lob. 389; and *καλοποιεῖν* (see above) 7th ed. was used for the more ancient phrase *καλῶς ποιεῖν*.

It cannot be denied that the preceding list contains many words formed, agreeably to the prevailing analogy of the time, by the Greek-speaking Jews, or even by the N. T. writers themselves (especially Paul, Luke, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Origen. orat. § 27); cf. particularly *ὀρθρίζειν* (ⲉⲣⲓⲣⲓ), *λιθοβολεῖν, αἱματεκχυσία, σκληροκαρδία, σκληροτράχηλος, ἀγαθοεργεῖν, ὀρθοποδεῖν, ὀρθοτομεῖν, μοσχοποιεῖν, μεγαλωσύνη, ταπεινοφροσύνη, παραβάτης, πατριάρχης, ἀγενεαλόγητος, ὑποπόδιον* (Sturz, 199), 25 *χρυσοδακτύλιος*. However, the circumstance that no traces of these words 8th ed. are to be found in the Greek writers still extant of the first centuries after Christ (but these have not yet been fully explored)² must not be regarded as altogether decisive. Many of the words in question may have been already current in the popular speech of the Greeks. But words denoting Jewish institutions, or heathenism as idolatry, originated of course among the Greek-speaking Jews themselves; such as, *σκηνοπηγία, εἰδωλόθυτον, εἰδωλολατρεία*. Lastly, many words assumed among the Jews a peculiar meaning resting on special Jewish modes of thought; as, *ἐπιστρέφειν, ἐπιστροφή*, absolutely used, to *convert, conversion, προσήλυτος, πεντεκοστή* *Whitsuntide, κόσμος* (in a figurative sense), *φυλακτήριον, ἐπιγαμβρεῖν* of the levirate marriage. In reference to Christian apostolic words and forms (such as *βάπτισμα*) see § 3 end, p. 35.

2. GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES: These are confined mostly to *inflections of nouns and verbs*, which were either unknown in the earlier language, or not used in certain words, or at least foreign to the literary Attic: for in this respect also the intermixture of dialects previously distinct became manifest. Moreover, the use of the Dual became rare.

¹ Popular Greek naturally adopted single foreign words (appellatives), with slight alterations, from the languages in use in the different provinces along with the Greek. On this, however, we cannot dwell in an inquiry so general as the above. With regard to the Egyptian element in the Septuagint and elsewhere, see Sturz, dialect. Alex. p. 84 sqq. Also Latin and Persian words and expressions have been pointed out in the N. T.; cf. *Olear.* de stylo N. T. p. 366 sq. 368 sqq.; *Georgi*, Hierocrit. I. p. 247 sqq. and the whole of II. (de latinismis N. T.). Cf. *Dresig*, de N. T. gr. latinismis merito et falso suspectis. Lips. 1726, 4to., and *Schleiermacher*, Hermeneutik, S. 62 f.

² Most of this description appear subsequently in the Byzantine authors, who abound in double compounds and lengthened forms of words. What had fallen into disuse was eagerly restored and revived.

The later Greek has few *syntactical* peculiarities. Certain verbs, for instance, are construed with cases different from those they formerly used 40 to govern (§ 31, 1. cf. Boissonade, anecd. III. 136, 154); conjunctions which previously took only the Subjunct. or Optat. are used with the Indic.; the use of the Optat., particularly in the oratio obliqua, decreases sensibly; the use of the future participle after verbs of going, sending, etc., recedes before that of the present (or the infinitive); Active verbs with *ἐαυρόν* begin to be substituted for Middle, when unemphatic. Also, in general, more forcible expressions lose their emphasis. On the other hand, additional expressiveness is aimed at even by grammatical forms, cf. *μειζότερος*, *ἴνα* instead of the Infinitive, etc. But the later varieties of inflection will most appropriately find place in § 4.

Later popular Greek had, beyond doubt, different peculiarities in different provinces. Critics, accordingly, have professed to discover Cilicisms in the style of Paul (Hieron. ad Algasiam quaest. 10. Tom. IV. ed. Marti- 27 anay, p. 204). The four examples, however, which this Father adduces 7th ed. are not conclusive (Michaelis, Einl. ins N. T. 1 Thl. S. 161); and as we know nothing respecting the provincialisms of Cilicia (see, however, Sturz, Dial. Alex. p. 62), it is better at present to dismiss the investigation altogether, than to rest it on empty conjectures. Cf. B. Stölberg, de Cilicismiss, a Paulo usurpatis, in his tr. de soloecismis N. T. p. 91 sqq.

§ 3. HEBREW-ARAMAIC TINGE OF THE N. T. DICTION.

This popular variety of Greek, however, was not spoken and written by the Jews without foreign admixture. They not only imparted to their Greek style the general complexion of their mother tongue, which consists in vividness and circumstantiality as well as uniformity of expression, but also introduced particular Jewish turns of expression. Yet both these peculiarities are more apparent in their translations directly from Hebrew, than in their original composition in Greek.¹

Lexical Hebraisms (and Aramaisms) are more numerous than grammatical; and consist partly in the extension of the signification of words, partly in the imitation of entire phrases, and partly also in the analogous formation of new words to express corresponding Hebrew terms. Thus originated a Jewish-Greek, which native Greeks did not entirely understand,² and which they even 41 sometimes turned into ridicule.

¹ Herein lies an argument, which has received little attention, why the text of the N. T. is not to be regarded as a translation from the Aramaic, and that too, in a great measure, clumsily executed.

² Though the opinion of *L. de Dieu* (præfat. ad grammat. orient.): facilius Euro-

- All the nations which after the death of Alexander continued under Graeco-Macedonian rule and which gradually adopted the Greek language of their conquerors even in common life, particularly the Syrians and Hebrews, spoke Greek less purely than native Greeks, and imparted to it more or less the impress of their mother tongue (Salmas. de lingua Hellen. p. 121, cf. Joseph. antt. 20, 9).¹ As the Greek-speaking Jews are usually denominated Hellenists, this Oriental variety of Greek, known to us only in the writings of Jews, has not improperly obtained the name of the Hellenistic idiom; see Buttm. I. S. 6.² Accordingly, the diction of the LXX. and of the N. T. (of the Pseudepigrapha of the O. T. and the Apocrypha of the N. T.) has been especially called Hellenistic; yet it was not Drusius (ad Act. vi. 6), but Scaliger (animad. in Euseb. p. 134), who first employed this term.
- 42 The Hebraisms of the N. T. — for these only, and not the oriental cast of the periods and arrangement of words, were usually attended to — have been collected frequently and thoroughly; in particular by Vorst, Leusden (in his Philol. hebr., from which the dissertatio de dialectis N. T. sing. de ejus hebraismis was separately printed by J. F. Fischer, Lips. 1754,

paéis foret Platonis Aristotelisque elegantiam imitari, quam Platoni Aristotelive N. T. nobis interpretari, is decidedly an exaggeration. Still, the circumstance mentioned above may in general explain the fact that learned Greek transcribers, or possessors of MSS. of the N. T., often took the liberty of making corrections in order to bring the diction nearer to Grecian elegance; see Hug, Einl. ins N. T. I. S. 129.

¹ It is well known that Greek subsequently became *Latinized*, also, when the Romans began to write in that language. The Latin coloring, however, is not very marked before the Byzantine literature, even in Greek translations from Latin authors, such as that of Eutropius by Paeanius, of Cicero's Cat. Maj. and Somn. Scip. by Theodorus (published by Götz. Nürnberg. 1801. 8vo.). This was partly owing to the much closer affinity between Greek and Latin than between Hebrew and Greek, and partly because these authors had made Greek a special study.

² This appellation ought to be resumed as a technical term, it is so thoroughly appropriate. For *ἡλληνοστῆς* in the N. T. (Acts vi. 1) denotes a Greek-speaking Jew; (for compilations respecting *ἡλληνίζειν* rather than *ἡλληνοστῆς*, see Wetstein II. p. 490; Lob. p. 379 sq.). The notion of *Salmasius*, that in the N. T. *Hellenist* means a Greek proselyte to Judaism, is a rash conclusion from Acts vi. 5, and Eichstädt (ad *Mori* across. herm. I. p. 227) should not have adopted it. Moreover, the controversy between *Dn. Heinsius* (exercit. de lingua hellenist. L. B. 1643. 8vo.), and *Salmasius* (hellenistica L. B. 1643. 8vo.; funus linguae hellen. ib. 1643. 8vo.; ossilegium linguae hellen. ib. 1643. 8vo.), on the appellation *dialectus hellenistica*, related not merely to the word *Hellenistic*, but still more to the term *dialectus*, for which Salmasius wished to substitute *character* or *stylus idioticus* (de Hellenist. p. 250), compare also *Tittmann*, Synonym. I. p. 259 sq. Yet the term dialect (*διάλεκτος τοπική*) might be allowable to denote, particularly in accordance with the very extensive meaning of the verb *διαλέγεσθαι* (see, e.g. Strabo 8, 514), that variety of Greek spoken by Hellenistic Jews. Other dissertations on the designation dialect. hellenist. see in *Walch*, bib. theol. IV. p. 278 sq. and *Fabric. biblioth. graec. ed. Harles. IV. p. 893 sq.* Thiersch and Rost have begun to call the language of the Greek Bible the *ecclesiastical dialect*. This, however, is too narrow for the subject discussed above, and the word *dialect* is inappropriate.

1792, 8vo.), and Olearius (de Stylo N. T. p. 232 sqq.), cf. also Hartmann, linguist. Einl. in das Stud. d. A. T. S. 382 ff. Anm. Still, this matter ought to have been executed with more critical precision.¹ Nearly all who have written on this subject hitherto, are chargeable, more or less, with the following errors :

a. They did not give sufficient attention to the Aramaic elements in the diction of the N. T.² In the time of Christ, as all know, the popular speech 29 of the Jews in Palestine was not the old Hebrew, but Syro-Chaldaic; 7th ed. accordingly, many of the most current expressions of common life³ must have been introduced into Jewish-Greek from this dialect. Among the 28 older writers Olearius has a special section de Chaldaeo-Syriasmis N. T. 6th ed. p. 345 sqq. (cf. Georgi, Hierocrit. I. p. 187 sqq.). More recently, a great deal relating to this subject has been collected by Boysen (krit. Erläuterungen des Grundtextes d. N. T. aus der syrischen Uebersetzung. Quedlinb. 1761, 8vo., 3 Stücke), Agrell (oratio de dictione N. T. Wexion. 1798, and otiola Syriaca. Lund. 1816, 4to. pp. 53–58), and Hartmann (as above, 382 ff.). Already had several earlier commentators occasionally directed attention to Aramaisms; see Michaelis, Einleit. ins N. T. 1 Thl. S. 138 ff.; Fischer ad Leusden, p. 140; Bertholdt's Einleit. 1 Thl. S. 158. — Under this head come also the (few) Rabbinisms (see Olear. l. c. p. 360 sqq.; Georgi l. c. p. 221 sqq.), for the elucidation of which much may still be derived from Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. They are mostly terms that may have been used in the Rabbinical schools as early as the time of Christ.

b. They overlooked almost entirely the difference in style of the several writers; so that according to their collections all the books of the 43 N. T. appear to abound in Hebraisms to the same extent. But in this particular no little dissimilarity exists, and Matthew, Luke, John, Paul, James, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews ought by no means to be thrown together promiscuously.⁴ Those learned collectors failed also

¹ A new and complete treatise on the Hebraisms of the N. T., elaborated critically and on rational principles, is certainly needed. Meanwhile, the commencement recently made (*D. E. F. Bockel*, de hebraismis N. T. Spec. 1. Lips. 1840, 8vo.) deserves to be gratefully recognized.

² Many of the peculiarities pointed out by the Hebraists might with equal propriety be called either Hebraisms or Syriasmis: e.g. *el* for an indefinite article, and the frequent use of participles with *elva* for a finite verb. It is preferable, however, to regard these and the like as Aramaisms, since they are far more common and more distinctly established in the Aramaic, and occur almost exclusively in those later Hebrew writings the style of which approaches the Aramaic. This refers principally to the diction of the N. T., for the Septuagint exhibits but few Aramaisms. Cf. *Olear.* p. 308; *Gesen.* Com. zu Jes. I. 63.

³ To these the Aramaisms of the N. T. are, essentially, confined. For the religious expressions are to be connected (through the medium of the Sept. in the case of the majority of extra-Palestinean Jews) with the Ancient Hebrew, the sacred language. To the same class also belongs *edvaros*, *pestilence*, Rev. vi. 8; xviii. 8 (מָוֶת, מָוֶת); cf. *Ewald*, Com. in Apoc. p. 122.

⁴ Even in one and the same writer we find a want of uniformity. Thus Luke in his

to show the relation between the diction of the N. T. and that of the Septuagint; though, great as the resemblance is, considerable dissimilarity exists, and, speaking generally, the style of the LXX. as a direct and in part a literal translation of the Hebrew text is more Hebraistic than that of the N. T.

c. They included in their list of Hebraisms many expressions which are not unknown to the Greek prose writers, or are the common property of many languages; and, in general, they were guided by no distinct notion of what constitutes a Hebraism; see Tittmann, *de causis contortar. interpretatt.* N. T. p. 18 sq. (Synonym. I. p. 269 sqq.); de Wette in the *A. L. Z.* 1816. N. 39. S. 306.

They made a threefold use of the term Hebraism, viz. to designate

1. Such words, phrases, and constructions, as are peculiar to the Hebrew (Aramaean) tongue, and to which there is nothing corresponding in Greek prose; e.g. *σπαραγχνίζεσθαι*, *ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι*, *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*, *οἰκοδομεῖν* (in a figurative sense), *πλατύνειν τὴν καρδίαν*, *πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω*, οὐ πᾶς (for οὐδεὶς), *ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τινι* and *ἐν τινι*, etc.

2. Such words, etc. as, though occasionally occurring in Greek authors, are imitated by the writers of the N. T. directly from their native tongue; e.g. *σπέρμα* for *proles* (Schwarz, *Comm.* p. 1235) hebr. שֵׁרָץ; *ἀνάγκη* *distress, calamity* (cf. D. Sic. 4, 43; Schwarz, as above, p. 81) hebr. צָרָה, צָרָה, צָרָה, צָרָה; *ἐρωτᾶν request* (as *בָּשָׂא* denotes both *request* and *interrogate*, cf. the Latin *rogare*) Babr. 97, 3; Apollon. synt. p. 289; *εἰς ἀπάντησιν* (D. Sic. 8, 59; Polyb. 5, 26, 8) cf. *בְּכָל דָּבָר*; *πέρατα τῆς γῆς* (Thuc. 1, 69; Xen. Ages. 9, 4; Dio Chr. 62. 587) cf. *כָּל הָאָרֶץ*; *χίλος* for *littus* (Her. 1, 191; Strabo, and others) cf. *חֶסֶד*; *στόμα* of a *sword* (חֶרֶב) cf., besides the Poets, Philostrate. her. 19, 4. So also the expression *ἐνδύσασθαι Χριστόν* (*Ταρκύνιον ἐνδύσ.* in Dion. H.), formed after *בָּרַךְ בְּבֶן*, etc. Cf. above, p. 17.

3. Such words, etc., as are equally common in Greek and in Hebrew, and with regard to which, accordingly, there is room for doubt whether they are to be considered as portions of the popular Greek adopted by the Jews, or as currently employed by them through the influence of their native tongue; e.g. *φυλάσσειν νόμον*, *αἷμα caedes*, *ἀνὴρ* joined to an appellative (*ἀνὴρ φονεύς*), *παῖς slave*, *μεγαλύνειν to praise*, *διώκειν to pursue*, (*cultivate*) a virtue. To this head may be referred many of the grammatical illustrations contained in Haab's grammar.

4. Lastly, it cannot be denied that in a great many passages expositors introduced imaginary Hebraisms (Aramaisms); as, Eph. v. 26, *ἐν ῥήματι* *יְהוָה* (see Koppe); Matt. xxv. 23, *χαρά convivium* from Aram.

Gospel, where he had to follow the evangelical *paradosis*, hebraizes more than in the Acts; the deterioration in the diction after the proem of the Gospel was long ago pointed out. The hymns, also, and the speeches, have more of a Hebrew coloring than the narrative part; cf. e.g. Luke i. 13–20, 42–55, 68–79. The linguistic relation of Luke to the Synoptics has not yet been systematically exhibited.

תַּרְגָּו (see Fischer, ad Leusden dial. p. 52) or Hebr. תַּרְגָּו, Esth. ix. 17, etc. (Eichhorn, Einl. ins N. T. I. 528) ; Matt. vi. 1, *δικαιοσύνη* *alms* from Chald. תַּרְגָּא; Matt. xxi. 13, *ἀγοραῖ* *traders* (Fischer, ad Leusden dial. p. 48) ; and during the process many a misuse of the Sept. crept in (as Luke xi. 22, *σκεῦλα suppellex*, cf. Esth. iii. 13 ; Acts ii. 24, *ὧδινες vincula*, cf. Ps. xviii. 6). And to crown all, *πέραν on this side*, like תַּרְגָּו (?) ! Cf. also Fr. Rom. I. 367.¹

It is obvious from what has been said that there are two kinds of Hebraisms in the N. T., one of which may be called *perfect*, and the other *imperfect*. By *perfect* Hebraisms we mean those words, phrases, and constructions which are strictly peculiar to the Hebrew (Aramaean) language, and therefore were transferred directly thence into the Hellenistic idiom, (the diction of the N. T.).² On the other hand, we call *imperfect* Hebraisms 31 all words, phrases, and constructions which, though to be found also in 7th ed. Greek prose authors, are in all probability introduced directly from the Hebrew (Aramaean) : first, because the N. T. writers were more familiar with Aramaean than with Greek ; and secondly, because the phraseology in question was of more frequent occurrence in the former language than in the latter. De Wette also perceived this distinction, and stated it as follows (as above, S. 319) : "Certainly it makes an essential difference whether a form of speech is wholly foreign to the Greek, or, on the other hand, finds in Greek a point of contact to which it can attach itself."

This whole investigation must be carried farther back ; and first of all the *origin* of the so-called Hebraisms must be considered. In doing this, however, we cannot take the LXX.³ as our basis, since they, as translators, 30 furnish no sure testimony respecting that Greek diction of the Jews which 6th ed. was formed *independently* and by oral intercourse. Nor can we immediately use for this purpose the doctrinal parts of the N. T., as the *religious* phraseology of the Jews in Greek was naturally a close imitation of the Hebrew, and formed on the model of the Septuagint. But it is pre-eminently from the narrative style of the Apocrypha, the Gospels, and the Acts, that the influence of Hebrew on the Greek of Jews is to be most clearly determined.

In the first place, it is plain that original writers, scarcely less than 45 translators, unconsciously gave their Greek style the *general* impress of the Hebrew-Aramaic idiom, from the influence of which, as their mother

¹ In the title of *Kaiser's* dissertation de linguae aramaicae usu cet. Norimb. 1831. 8vo. the word *abusu* would be nearer the truth.

² *Blessig's* definition is : Hebraismus est solius hebraei sermonis propria loquendi ratio, cuiusmodi in graecam vel aliam linguam sine barbarismi suspicione transferre non licet.

³ The most important work that has yet appeared on the linguistic element of the Septuagint, is *H. W. Jos. Thiersch*, de Pentateuchi versione alex. libb. 3. Erlang. 1840. 8vo., from which I have obtained many acceptable illustrations for the later editions of this Grammar. But a complete exhibition of the diction of the Septuagint is very much needed.

tongue, they could not rid themselves without great attention and long practice. This *general* impress consists, partly in explicitness (hence the use of prepositions with cases instead of cases alone, the latter construction implying more abstraction), and a predilection for circumstantiality (φεύγων ἀπὸ προσώπου τινός, ἐγράφη διὰ χειρός τ., πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ὥς μεγάλου, καὶ ἔσται — καὶ ἔχεν, and the like; the frequent use of the pers. and dem. pron. particularly after the relative, the narrative expression καὶ ἐγένετο, etc.); partly in the simplicity, and even monotony, with which the Hebrew (agreeably to a co-ordinating, rather than subordinating principle) constructs periods, and links clause to clause. Hence the sparing use of conjunctions in Jewish-Greek (in which respect the classic authors display so copious a variety); hence the uniformity in the use of the tenses; 32 hence the absence of periodic combination of several subordinate clauses 7th ed. into a single sentence, and, in connection with this, the scanty use of participial constructions, so frequent and so diversified among the Greeks.

In narration, a further prominent peculiarity of Hebrew-Greek consists in this, that the words of another are almost always quoted directly; whereas the indirect introduction of quotations gives a distinctive cast to the Greek historical style, and occasions particularly the diversified use of the Optative, a mood almost unknown in the Greek writings of Jews.

From this *general* Jewish influence alone the Greek of the Jews must have received a strongly marked character; but in *particulars* it received a great additional influence, and it is these particulars which are usually styled Hebraisms.

a. Attaching the derivative meanings of a vernacular word to that foreign word which corresponds to it in primary signification was the simplest mode of Hebraizing (cf. *ἑρωτᾶν* אָפַשׁ *to interrogate* and *to request*). Hence it would not be strange if the Jews had used δικαιοσύνη for *alms*, according to the use of צדקה. Less dubious instances are 31 3rd ed. as 31 3rd ed. as בְּרָה־ denotes both (Sept. Gen. xxxviii. 11); εἰς for *primus* (in certain cases) like אֶחָד; ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τινι also *praise one* (thanking), like הַלְלוּ (Ps. cvi. 47; cxvii. 4, and elsewhere in Sept.); εὐλογεῖν *bless*, i.e. make happy, like בָּרַךְ; κτίσις *thing created, creation*, cf. Chald. בְּרִיתָא; δόξα *brightness*, like כְּבוֹד; δυνάμεις *miracles*, קְשָׁרִים. The transfer of figurative senses is the most frequent; as, ποτήριον *sors, portio* Matt. xx. 22 (כוס); σκάνδαλον *stumbling-block* in a moral sense (מַכְשָׁל); γλῶσσα *for nation* (לָשׁוֹן); χεῖλος *for speech* (שִׁפְתַּי); ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (לְפָנֵי יְהוָה) *according to God's judgment*; 46 καρδία εὐθεία (יֵרֶךְ); περιπατεῖν *walk*, of one's course of life; ὁδός (דֶּרֶךְ) cf. Schäf. ind. ad Aesop. p. 148; ἀνάθημα *not merely what is consecrated to God, but, agreeably to the Heb. חֵרֶם, to be destroyed*, Rom. ix. 8, Deut. vii. 26, Josh. vi. 17, and elsewhere; λύειν Matt. xvi. 19 *for declare lawful*, after the Rabbin. הֵקִיף.

b. Numerous Hebraisms arose from the verbal translation of certain

very common vernacular expressions; as, *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* for פָּנֵי אָדָם; *ζητεῖν ψυχὴν* for חָפֵץ בְּנַפְשׁוֹ; *ποιεῖν ελεος (χάρις) μετά τινος*, for עָשָׂה חֶסֶד וְחֶנֶּחֱמִים אֵלֶיךָ; *ἀνοίγειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς* or *τὸ στόμα τινός* (חָפֵץ); *γεύεσθαι θανάτου* מִתְחַבֵּר מָוֶת (Talm.); *ἄρτον φαγεῖν* (*coenare*) for חָבֵץ לֶחֶם; *αἷμα ἐκχέειν* (כָּסָה) *kill*; *ἀνίστημι σπέρμα τινί* for הִנֵּחַ זֶרַע לְאָדָם; *υἱὸς θανάτου* for בֶּן-מָוֶת (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος); *καρπὸς ὀσφύος* for פְּרִי-הַבֶּטֶן; *καρπὸς κοιλίας* for פְּרִי-בֶטֶן; *ἐξέρχεται ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος τινός* for יָצָא מִבֶּטֶן אָדָם; *ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός* for יָצָא מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי; *δφείλημα ἀφιέναι* for מְחִילָה (Talm.); also *στηρίζειν πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ* for מְחִילָה פָּנָיו; *πᾶσα σάρξ* for כָּל-בָּשָׂר.

33
7th ed.

c. The formation of foreign derivatives in imitation of vernacular, implies more reflection and contrivance; as, *ὀλοκαύτωμα* (from *ὀλοκαυστῶν*, Lob. 524) for חֲבִיטָה; *σπλαγγνίζεσθαι* from *σπλάγχνα*, as פָּחַד is connected with פָּחַד; *σκανδαλίζειν, σκανδαλίζεσθαι*, like בִּזְיוֹן, בִּזְיוֹנִי; *ἐγκαινίζειν* from *ἐγκαίνια*, as חֲדָשׁ is related to חֲדָשָׁה; *ἀναθεματίζειν*, like מְחִילָה; *ὀρθρίζειν*, like מְחִילָה; perhaps *ἐνωπίζειν*, like מְחִילָה, cf. Fischer ad Leusden dial. p. 27. *Προσωποληπτύν*, for which even the Hebr. has no single corresponding word, goes still further.

All this easily accounts for the predominant Hebrew-Aramaic complexion of the style of the N. T. writers, who were not, like Philo and Josephus,² acquainted with Greek literature, and did not aim at writing correct Greek. Hence, the whole cast of their composition (particularly the want of compactness, especially in narration) must have offended a cultivated Greek ear; indeed, numerous single expressions must either have conveyed to a native Greek an erroneous meaning, or have been entirely unintelligible (such as *ἀφιέναι ὀφειλήματα*,³ *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*, *λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, and the like); cf. Gataker de Stylo N. T. cap. 5. Hence also is explained why such Hebraistic turns of expression are less frequent in the original authors of the N. T. than in the translators of the O. T., and in the *Hellenistic* writers of the N. T. (Paul, Luke, particularly in the

32
8th ed.

¹ A similar Grecism in Latin is e.g. *a teneris unguiculis* (Cic. fam. 1, 6, 3), which although a Greek phrase was quite intelligible to the Romans, as e.g. *καρπὸς χειλέων*, though it must have had a strange sound, was unquestionably intelligible to the Greeks; cf. *καρπὸς φρενῶν*, Pind. Nem. 10, 22. Still more easily must the Greeks have understood *καρπὸς κοιλίας*, since *fruit*, by itself, (for fruit of the body) was used in unambiguous connections, as well among the Greeks (Arist. polit. 7, 16; Eurip. Bacch. 1305), as elsewhere; cf. *Ruhnken*, ad Homer. in Cerer. 23.

² Though even Josephus, when narrating Old Test. history after the Septuagint, does not always avoid Hebraisms; see *Scharfenberg*, de Josephi et LXX. consensu, in *Pott's* sylloge, VII. p. 306 ff.

³ That is, in the signification of remitting *sins*, so far, therefore, as regards *ὀφειλήματα*. For, *ἀφιέναι remit*, even applied to offences, occurs in Her. 6, 30, in the expression *ἀφιέναι αἰτίαν*, and *ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι debita remittere* (obligatory acts), is quite common. In later Greek we find *ἀφιέναι τι τὴν ἀδικίαν*, Plutarch, Pomp. 34; see *Coraes* and *Schäff*, in loc. The well-known phrase *ἐβρίσκεν χάριν* would likewise have been understood by a native Greek, though it would have sounded strange to him (instead of *ἐβρίσκεσθαι*).

second part of the Acts, John, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Tholuck, Com. Cap. I. § 2. S. 25 sqq.) than in those more strictly Palæstinean (Matthew, Peter).¹ And it is obvious, further, that not all the Hebraisms in the diction of the apostles were adopted *unconsciously* (van d. Honert, Synt. p. 103). Religious expressions — and of these the main portion of N. T. Hebraisms consist — they must have been influenced to retain by the circumstance that in these expressions their religious ideas themselves were embodied, and because Christianity had to be built on a Jewish foundation.² The existing Greek, too, possessed in fact no phraseology for the profound religious phaenomena which apostolic Christianity disclosed.³ Still, it is an exaggeration to assert, with Eichhorn and Bretschneider (Prefat. ad Lexic. N. T. ed. 2. II. p. 12),⁴ that the authors of the N. T. in composition did all their thinking in Hebrew or Aramaic. That is the process of a tyro. We moderns even, in writing Latin, after we have attained a certain proficiency, gradually (though never altogether) cease to think first in our vernacular. Men who, though not regularly trained in the study of language, were constantly hearing Greek spoken and very frequently, yes ordinarily, speaking it themselves, must soon have acquired such a command of its words and phrases and such skill in expression, that in composition the Greek would present itself directly, and not solely through the medium of Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic words and phrases.⁵ The comparison of the authors of the N. T. with modern beginners in writing Latin, or even with (uneducated) Jews speaking

¹ The Grecian training of individual writers appears particularly in the appropriate use of *verba composita* and *decomposita*.

² Cf. Beza, ad Act. x. 46. Rambach is not altogether wrong in saying (institut. hermen. 1, 2, 2): lingua N. T. passim ad ebraei sermonis indolem conformata est, ut hoc modo concentus scripturae utriusque test. non in rebus solum sed ipsis etiam in verbis clarius observaretur. Cf. Pfaff, nott. ad Matt. p. 34; Olear. 341 sqq.; Tittmann, de dilig. gramm. p. 6 sq. (Synon. I. p. 201 sq.). Further cf. J. W. Schröder, de causis quare dictio pure graeca in N. T. plerumque praetermissa sit, Marb. 1768. 4to.; also van Hengel, com. in ep. ad Philipp. p. 19.

³ Some good remarks on this point are to be found in Hvalstroem, spec. de usu graecitatis alex. in N. T. (Upsal. 1794. 4to.) p. 6 sq. Van den Honert went even so far as to assert: vol ipse Demosthenes, si eandem rem, quam nobis tradiderunt apostoli, debita perspicuitate et efficacia perscribere voluisset, hebraismorum usum evitare non potuisset.

⁴ The latter, however, recalled this opinion, so far at least as regards Paul (Grundlage des evang. Pietism. n. s. v. S. 179).

⁵ How easily do we, who never heard Latin spoken by a native Roman, attain the power of at once conceiving in Latin, dixit verum esse, or quam virtutem demonstravit aliis praestare, and the like, without first mentally construing dixit quod verum sit, or de qua virtute demonstravit, quod ea, etc. Thinking in conformity to the genius of one's mother tongue, appears particularly in phrases and figures which have become habitual, and which one introduces unconsciously in speaking or writing a foreign language. So it was with the apostles, who constantly employed, and with perfect propriety, along with many Hebraistic expressions, numerous Greek phrases entirely foreign to the genius of Hebrew.

German, is as incorrect as it is unworthy; cf. Schleiermacher, *Hermeneut. S.* 54, 59, 257. Besides, it is forgotten that the apostles found a Jewish-Greek idiom already current, and therefore did not first frame for themselves most of their phraseology by thinking it out in Hebrew.

(Many Greek words are used by the N. T. writers with a specific reference to the Christian system (even in contrast with Judaism), so to speak, like religious technical terms. Hence arises, apparently, a third element of N. T. diction, viz. the *distinctively Christian* (see Olear. de Stylo N. T. p. 380 sqq. ed. Schwarz; Eckard, *technica sacra*. Quedlinb. 1716. 4to.). Compare particularly the words *ἔργα* (*ἐργάζεσθαι* Rom iv. 4), *πίστις*, *πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν* or *πιστεύειν* absol., *ὁμολογία*, *δικαιοσύνη* and *δικαιοῦσθαι*, *ἐκλέγεσθαι*, *οἱ κλητοί*, *οἱ ἐκλεκτοί*, *οἱ ἅγιοι* (for *Christians*), *οἱ πιστοί* and *οἱ ἄπιστοι*, *οἰκοδομή* and *οἰκοδομεῖν* in the figurative sense, *ἀπόστολος*, *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* and *κηρύττειν* absol. for Christian preaching, the appropriation of *βάπτισμα* for Christian baptism, perhaps *κλῶν . . . τὸν . . . ἄρτον* for the holy repasts (the *Agape* with the Communion), *ὁ κόσμος*, *ἡ σὰρξ*, *ὁ σαρκικός*, in the familiar theological sense, etc. Most of these expressions, however, already existed in the O. T. and in rabbinical writings.¹ Accordingly it will not be easy to prove any phraseology to be altogether peculiar to the apostles—to have been *introduced* by them. This apostolic element, therefore, is restricted rather to the *meaning* and application of words and phrases, and lies on the very outskirts of the province of *philological* inquiry. Cf., however, Schleiermacher, *Hermeneut. S.* 56, 67 f. 138 f. [and G. v. Zezschwitz, *Profangräcität u. biblisch. Sprachgeist. Eine Vorl. üb. die bibl. Umbildung hellenischer Begriffe, bes. der psychologischen.* Leipz. 1859. 8vo.]. In the historical vocabulary *πάσχειν* to *suffer*, and *παράδοσθαι* to *be delivered up*, absol., had established themselves as technical expressions for the last earthly fate of Jesus.)

Grammatical Hebraisms will be discussed in the next section.

§ 4. GRAMMATICAL CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION.

34
6th ed.

As respects the grammatical character of the N. T. diction, those same two elements above mentioned may be distinctly traced. That is to say, here also the peculiarities of the N. T. phraseology are, fundamentally, those of the later (common) Greek language, and consist more in certain forms of inflection than in syntactical combinations. With these are occasionally mingled (though far

¹ To attempt to explain such expressions in the Christian terminology of the apostles by quotations from Greek authors (cf. *Krebs*, observ. prae. p. 4) is extremely absurd. But, on the other hand, it is necessary to distinguish the diction of the apostles, far more tinged as it was with Old Testament peculiarities, from the terminology of the Greek Church, which was constantly growing more and more peculiar.

less copiously) Hebrew turns and constructions in the use of all the parts of speech. A predilection for prepositions where the Greeks employ cases alone is especially noticeable. In general the grammatical character of the N. T. idiom conforms to the laws of the Greek language; the authors of the N. T. have even adopted many constructions peculiarly Greek (attraction of the relative and the preposition), and have observed strictly, though as by mere instinct, numerous distinctions entirely foreign to Hebrew (e.g. that between the negatives οὐ and μή, etc.).

- 49 We find it true in Greek, as in almost all languages the history of whose growth can be traced, that changes produced by time are lexical in their nature far more than grammatical (compare, for instance, the German of Luther's translation of the Bible with that of the present day). For the 36 later common Greek exhibits but few grammatical peculiarities, and these 7th ed. almost all relate to inflections. We find, that is to say, first and foremost, a number of inflections in nouns and verbs which either were not used at all previously, and were first formed in later times by the abbreviation or the extension of the original forms, or which pertained exclusively to some one of the dialects. Of the latter sort are, for example, a. *Attic* inflections: τιθέασι, ἡβουλήθη, ἡμελλε, βούλει (βούλη), ὄψει; b. *Doric*: ἡ λυμός as fem., ἦτω (ἔστω), ἀφένται (ἀφείνται); c. *Æolic*: the Optat. in εια in 1st Aor. (yet this was early adopted into Attic); d. *Ionic*: γήρει, σπείρης, εἶπα (1st Aor.). As forms quite unknown in the earlier language must be mentioned, Datives like νοί, Imperat. κάθου, Perfects like ἔγνωκαν (for ἐγνώκασι), 2d Aorists and Imperfects like κατελίποσαν, ἔδολιούσαν, 2d Aorists like εἶδαμεν, ἔφυγαν, the Subjunctive Future § 13, 1. e., the Imperf. ἤμεθα. To this head specially belong many tenses, regular indeed according to analogy, but in place of which the earlier language used other forms; as, ἡμάρτησα for ἡμαρτον, αὖξω for αὐξάνω, ἦξα from ἦκα, φάγομαι for ἔδομαι, etc.; indeed, the multiplication of tense and mood forms, of which for euphony's sake only a few had been previously in use, is one of the characteristics of the later language. Further, many nouns received a new 35 gender, as ἡ for ὁ βᾶτος, and acquired thus a twofold declension; as, 7th ed. πλούτος, θεός; see § 9 note 2, p. 65.

Peculiarities of *syntax* are less numerous in the later language, — appearing chiefly in a careless use of the moods with particles. The following are instances under this head in the N. T.: *σαν* with the Indic. Pret., *ει* with the Subj., *ἵνα* with the Indic. Pres., verbs such as γένεσθαι, καταδικάζειν construed with the Acc., προσκυνεῖν and προσφονεῖν with Dat. of pers. (see Lob. 463; Mth. II. 902), the weakening of *ἵνα* in phrases like θέλω ἵνα, ἀξίος ἵνα, etc., the employment of the Gen. Inf. (τοῦ ποιεῖν) beyond its original and natural bounds, the use of the Subj. for the Optat. in narration after Preterites, and in general the infrequent use of the

Optat., which in Modern Greek has entirely disappeared. *Μέλλειν, θέλει*, etc., are more commonly followed by the Aor. Inf. (Lob. 747). The neglect of declension is just beginning to appear; thus, *μετὰ τοῦ ἐν*, and the like (which is, however, put designedly), § 10 end. Subsequently the misapplication of cases and tenses in some instances also occurs. Thus *σύν* with the Gen. in Niceph. Tact. (Hase ad Leon. Diac. p. 38), *ἀπό* with the Acc. in Leo Grammat. (p. 232) and then in Modern Greek, the interchange of the Aor. and Pres. participles in Leo Diac. and elsewhere. The Dual was gradually superseded by the Plural.

In a *grammatical* point of view the N. T. idiom bears few traces of Hebrew influence. True, the grammatical structure of the Hebrew (Aramaic) language differs essentially from that of the Greek; but this must have tended rather to prevent the Greek-speaking Jews from mixing vernacular with Greek constructions. (Such mixture of constructions would be far easier to a German in speaking Latin or French.) Besides, every one makes the *grammatical* laws of a foreign language his own, more easily than he does its store of words and phrases and its general idiomatic peculiarities (cf. Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 73). This is so because the rules of syntax are but few in comparison with the number of words and phrases, and because these rules too (especially the principal ones, which are fundamental to accurate, not elegant, composition) by oral intercourse are far more frequently brought before the mind. The Jews, therefore, must have been able readily to acquire such a mastery of the grammatical rules of the Greek then current—which by no means possessed all the niceties of Attic—as sufficed for their simple mode of communicating their thoughts. Even the Seventy have succeeded for the most part in recasting Hebrew constructions into accurate Greek.¹ Only a few vernacular idioms of frequent occurrence, and not at variance with the rules of Greek Grammar, have been retained to the letter (such as instead of the Optat. an interrogative clause expressing a wish, 2 Sam. xv. 4, *τίς με καταστήσει κριτήν*; xxiii. 15; Num. xi. 29; Deut. v. 26; xxviii. 67; Cant. viii. 1²), or, where it could be done, rendered in accordance at least with Greek analogy (as, *θανάτῳ ἀποθανείσθε* Gen. iii. 4, *τίς γάρ σου* Deut. xx. 17; 1 Sam. xiv. 39; Isa. xxx. 19) or by a construction already usual in Greek (see, however, § 45, 8), Judg. xv. 2 *μισῶν ἐμίσησας* for *ἐμίσησας* *ἐμίσησας*, Gen. xliii. 2; Ex. xxii. 17; xxiii. 26; 1 Sam. ii. 25, etc.;

¹ Certain Greek idioms became quite habitual to them, such as the article with qualifying words and phrases after a noun (*ὁ κύριος ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ*, and the like), the attraction of the relative, etc. Negatives, also, they almost always distinguish correctly. The more extended use of the Greek cases is exhibited by the better translators, as e.g. Gen. xxvi. 10, *μικροῦ ἐκουμήθη* it wanted little that, etc.

² Cf. Rom. vii. 24, where Fr. adduces similar instances from Greek poets. The construction with *πῶς* (ἅν) followed by the Optat. or Subjunct. is discussed by Schaefer, ad Soph. Oed. Col. p. 523, and Melet. p. 100.

cf. also Inf. with τοῦ.¹ Hebrew constructions thoroughly repugnant to the genius of the Greek, the Septuagint have usually rejected. For instance, the Fem. for the Neut. occurs only in a few passages, where the translators have not duly adverted to the meaning of the text, or have given it a nervously literal rendering; as, Ps. cxix. 50; cxviii. 23;² and it is hardly allowable to suppose that they designedly employed it for the Neut. In other passages the Heb. Fem. refers manifestly to a feminine subject indicated in the context; as, Judges xix. 30. On the other hand, ἐν ταύτῃ in Neh. xiii. 14 is probably equivalent to ταύτῃ in Greek authors, *in this respect, hoc in genere* (Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 5) or *therefore* (cf. ταύτῃ ὅτι propterea quod, Xen. Anab. 2, 6, 7); see also 1 Sam. xi. 2. The construction of Hebrew verbs with prepositions is imitated oftenest; as, φείδεσθαι ἐπὶ τινι Deut. vii. 16, or ἐπὶ τινι Ezek. vii. 4, οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν τινι Neh. iv. 10 (בְּ בִנְיָן), ἐπερωτᾶν ἐν κυρίῳ (חֲרֹץ בְּיָדָיו) 1 Sam. x. 22, εὐδοκεῖν ἐν τινι (בְּ יָדָיו Fr. Rom. II. 371). These imitations sound harsh in Greek, it must be confessed, yet in that flexible idiom they might find some point of affinity. (Cf. the Germ. bauen *an* etwas, fragen *bei*, etc.)

Even, however, if the Septuagint contained numerous other slavish imitations of Hebrew constructions, that would prove nothing in reference to the N. T. idiom. For, as has already been said, the style of these translators who, moreover, adhered for the most part with rigid exactness to the very letter of the Hebrew, — which sometimes indeed they did not even understand, — was by no means the model followed by the Jews in original composition or conversation. So far as regards the several rules of grammar, the N. T. is written thoroughly in Greek, and the few undoubted grammatical Hebraisms it contains become hardly discernible.

To Hebraisms of this sort may be referred, with more or less assurance,³ the use of prepositions where the Greeks employ cases alone (ἀποκρίπτεται ἀπὸ τινος, ἐσθίειν ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων, ἀθῶος ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, κοινωνὸς ἐν τινι, ἀρέσκειν and προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιόν τινος, εὐδοκεῖν and θέλειν ἐν τινι). Many such peculiarities, however, pertain to antique simplicity, and are accordingly in use among the Greeks themselves, especially the poets, and con-

¹ Hemsterhuis, ad Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3: saepenumero contingit, ut locutio quaedam native graeca a LXX. interpretib. et N. T. scriptoribus mutata paululum potestate ad hebraeam apte exprimendam adhibeatur.

² The translation of the Psalms is, in general, one of the most heedless. That of Nehemiah is little better. Aquila, who translated word for word (absurdly rendering for instance, the nota acc. ὦν by σύν), cannot be taken into consideration at all in an inquiry into the grammatical character of Hellenistic Greek. In order to give a literal translation he violates without hesitation the rules of grammar; as, Gen. i. 5, ἐκάλειεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ἡμέρα. And yet he always uses the article with propriety, and even employs the attraction of the relative; so deeply were both rooted in the Greek language!

³ Imaginary Hebraisms are, the supposed *Plur. excell.*, the *essentiae*, combinations erroneously regarded as circumlocutions for the superlative like σάλπιγξ τοῦ θεοῦ, the use of the Fem. for the Neut., and probably the Hypallage already mentioned τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης for ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς.

sequently do not exactly conflict with the genius of the language; as, *παύειν ἀπό τινος*.

Special and more decided instances are :

a. The verbal imitation of such Hebrew constructions as offend against Greek propriety ; as, *ὁμολογεῖν ἐν τινι*, *βλέπειν ἀπό σibi cavere a*, *προσέθετο πέμψαι*, *εἰ δοθήσεται* as a form of negatory oath ;

b. The repetition of a word to denote distribution, as *δύο δύο δινι*, instead of *ἀνὰ δύο* ;

c. The imitation of the Inf. absol. (see above) ;

d. The use of the Gen. of an abstract noun for the kindred adjective, and probably the very frequent use of the Inf. with a preposition (and its subject in the Acc.) in narration. 52

The peculiarities classed under a. and b. may be regarded as *pure* Hebraisms.

When, however, it is considered that by far the majority of constructions in the N. T. are genuine Greek, and that the N. T. writers have constantly employed such peculiarities of Greek syntax¹ as differed entirely 39 from their vernacular idiom, — as the distinction of the different past tenses, the use of *ἀν* with verbs, the attraction of the relative, such an expression as *οικονομίαν πεπίστευμαι*, the use of the Sing. with Neuters, etc., — we shall not be disposed to join in the cry about countless grammatical Hebraisms in the N. T. That the diction of the N. T. is grammatically far less Hebraistic than that of the Septuagint and the Palestinian Apocrypha, as might naturally be expected, will be manifest, if, when the expressions just specified as Hebraistic are observed in the Septuagint, it is also noticed that many a vernacular idiom in the LXX. never occurs in the N. T., or (such as an interrogative clause for the Opt.) only in solitary cases in impassioned style. A circumlocution for the Fut., as *ἔσομαι δίδónαι* Tob. v. 14, or the repetition of a substantive to denote *every* (Num. ix. 10 ; 2 Kings xvii. 29 ; 1 Chron. ix. 27), never occurs there.²

The N. T. writers considered separately exhibit extremely few purely 38 grammatical peculiarities. Only the book of Rev. requires particular, though not exceptional, attention in a treatise on the grammar of the N. T.

Finally, throughout the investigation into the grammatical character of the N. T. diction, it is obvious that the diversity of readings must be carefully attended to; on the other hand, it is also plain that verbal criticism can be successfully practised only in connection with a thorough acquaintance with the linguistic (lexical) peculiarities of the several N. T. writers.

¹ The more refined elegances of literary Attic are not to be found in the N. T., partly because they were unknown in the popular language adopted by the N. T. writers, partly because they were unsuited to the simple cast of thought of the sacred authors.

² Yet in the better translated portions of the O. T. and in the Palestin. Apocrypha we find single Greek constructions, on the other hand, instead of which the authors of the N. T. use the corresponding Hebraisms; thus, in 3 Esr. vi. 10 ; Tob. iii. 8, the Gen. is used with strict Grecian propriety. Further, cf. *Thiersch*, de Pentat. alex. p. 95 sq.

PART II.

THE GRAMMATICAL FORMS AS RESPECTS THEIR FORMATION. (INFLECTION.)

§ 5. ORTHOGRAPHY AND ORTHOGRAPHIC PRINCIPLES.

1. THE best manuscripts of the N. T. (like those of the Greek classics, see Poppo, Thuc. I. 214; Mth. I. 133) exhibit extraordinary variations of orthography, especially in regard to particular words and forms. Amid such diversity it cannot always be determined on satisfactory grounds what is correct. However, editors of the text should lay down precise rules, and carry them out consistently.

Though the various Codd. have recently been collated with greater diplomatic exactness, still, on many points, a more careful settlement of the facts is to be desired.

We submit the following remarks:

a. The use of an apostrophe to prevent a hiatus is of much rarer occurrence in the Codd. of the N. T. and of the Sept., than in the texts of native Greek authors (especially the orators; cf. G. E. Benseler, de hiatu in scriptorib. gr. P. I. Friberg. 1841. 8vo.; the same, de hiatu in Demosth. Friberg. 1847. 4to.): *ἄμα, ἄρα, ἀρα, γέ, ἐμέ, ἔτι, ἴνα, ὥστε*, never suffer elision of the last vowel; *δέ* (before *ἄν*) and *οὐδέ* very seldom (Matt. xxiii. 16 and 18; xxiv. 21; Rom. ix. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 21; Heb. viii. 4; Luke x. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 16; xi. 21; Phil. ii. 18; 1 John ii. 5; iii. 17). Only the prepositions *ἀπό, διά, ἐπί, παρά, μετά*, and the conjunction *ἀλλά* regularly suffer elision, the former particularly before pronouns and in phrases of frequent occurrence, as *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, etc.; *ἀντί* only in *ἀνθ' ὧν*. Yet the manuscripts vary in those cases, and even the best in particular passages, especially in regard to *ἀλλά*. Thus the Cod. Alex. [Sin.] and some others, have in Acts xxvi. 25 *ἀλλὰ ἀληθείας*; vii. 39 *ἀλλὰ ἀπόωσαντο*; 2 Pet. ii. 5 *ἀλλὰ*

ὄγδον. The best Codd. have 2 Cor. xii. 14 ἀλλὰ ὑμᾶς, and Gal. iv. 7 ἀλλὰ υἱός. So also the authority of manuscripts is in favor of, Luke ii. 36 μετὰ ἀνδρός; xiv. 31 μετὰ εἴκοσι; 2 Cor. vi. 15 μετὰ ἀπίστου; Rev. xxi. 13 ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν; Heb. xi. 34 ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, 41 Jude 14 ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ; 2 Cor. v. 7 διὰ εἶδους. Cf. also Acts ix. 6; 7th ed. x. 20; xvi. 37; 2 Cor. iv. 2; v. 12; Luke xi. 17 ἐπὶ οἶκον; Matt. 54 xxi. 5 ἐπὶ ὄνον, etc. There is a preponderance of authority for Luke iii. 2 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως, and Matt. xxiv. 7 ἐπὶ ἔθνος; 1 Cor. vi. 11 6th ed. ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε; whereas the authority is equal in Rom. vii. 13 for ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία and the other reading. Cf. besides, Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 125. That among Ionic authors the same indifference about shunning a hiatus prevails is well known; and accordingly this peculiarity in the N. T. is styled by the earlier biblical philologists an Ionism. Elision is neglected, however, by Attic prose authors, though the instances which Georgi produces from Plato cannot all be trusted (Hierocrit. N. T. I. p. 143). See Bttm. I. S. 123 ff.; Heupel, Marc. p. 33; Benseler, Exc. to his edition of Isocr. Areop. p. 385 sqq.; Jacobs, praef. ad Aelian. anim. p. 29 sq.; Thucyd. ed. Poppo III. II. 358. Perhaps this variation is not without principle, as e.g. Sintenis (Plutarch. vit. IV. p. 321 sqq.) has reduced to rules the use of the hiatus in Plutarch. In the N. T., too, the omission of the elision might be occasionally traced to the writer's intent, on one ground or another; not that the apostles bestowed attention on such things, but so far as they were guided by an instinctive sense of propriety. On this point, however, there is a risk of trifling (Bengel on 1 Cor. vi. 11)

Even in Lchm. the poetic quotation from Menander, 1 Cor. xv. 33, is written with the elision — *χρήσθ'* (for *χρηστὰ*) *ὁμιλίας κακαί*; cf. Georgi, Hierocrit. I. 186. The best Codd., however, of the N. T. [Sin. also] have *χρηστά*, which Tdf. has adopted.

b. In regard to final *ς* in *οὕτως*, *μέχρις*, and the so-called *ν ἐφέλκυστικόν* (Voemel, de *ν* et *ς* adductis literis. Fcf. a. M. 1853. 4to; Haake, Beiträge z. griech. Grammat. I. Heft), editors have mostly followed the known rule, which, however, has been restricted by more recent grammarians (Bttm. I. 92 ff.). But it is more advisable to be guided in every case by the authority of the best Codd., and accordingly recent N. T. critics have printed *οὕτως* and *ν ἐφέλκυστικόν* throughout, agreeably to the uncial Codd. (Tdf. praef. ad N. T. p. xxiii. [ed. vii. p. liii.]). Critics have tried to deduce from the Greek prose authors a fixed rule for determining when *οὕτως* or *οὕτω*, *εἶπεν* or *εἶπε*, etc., should be used (Bornem.

de gemina Cyrop. recens. p. 89, whom Poppo in his Index to the Cyrop. follows; Frotscher, Xen. Hier. p. 9; Bremi, Aeschin. Ctesiph. 3 and 4; Schäf. Demosth. I. p. 207; Mätzner, ad Antiphont. p. 192), and it is in itself not unlikely that the more careful authors were guided in this by euphony (Franke in Jahn's Jahrb. 1842. S. 247) and other considerations,¹ though ancient grammarians affirm (Bekkeri Aneod. III. p. 1400) that even the Attics wrote *ν ἐφέλ-*
 7th ed. *κυστικόν* indiscriminately before consonants even (Jacobs, praef.
 41 *ad Aelian. anim. p. 23 sq.*), and so it appears in the Codd.; cf.
 6th ed. *ad Aelian. anim. p. 23 sq.*), and so it appears in the Codd.; cf.
 55 also Bachmann, Lycophr. I. 156 sq.; Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 185 sq. On *μέχρι* and *μέχρις*, *ἄχρι* and *ἄχρις* in particular, see Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 479. According to the grammarians the Attic orthography requires *μέχρι* and *ἄχρι* even before a vowel (Th. M. p. 135; Phryn. p. 14; cf. Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. 8, 6, 20), and so they are printed by recent editors; cf. Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 183. and Sympos. p. 128; Schäf. Plutarch. V. p. 268. See in general Klotz, Devar. p. 231. Yet even in Attic authors good Codd. have not unfrequently the form with *ς*. In the N. T. the best Codd. give *μέχρι* invariably, and *ἄχρι* even before vowels, Acts xi. 5; xxviii. 15; but *ἄχρις οὐ*, Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xi. 26; xv. 25, etc., preponderates (also Acts vii. 18).

Codd. vary also as to *ν* in *εἴκοσι*, but the best are said to omit it, see Tdf. praef. ad N. T. p. 23 [ed. vii. p. 54], though in the appar. this matter is but seldom noticed. On *ἀντικρύς*, as most authorities [Sin. also] have in Acts xx. 15, not *ἀντικρύ*, see Lob. Phryn. p. 443 sq.; Bttm. II. 366.

c. In compounds whose first part ends in *ς*, Knapp, after Wolf (liter. Analect. 1 Bd. S. 460 ff.; cf. Krüg. S. 12), introduced the form *ς* for *σ*, and has been followed in this by Schulz and Fr., e.g. *ὥσπερ, ὅστις, δύσκολος, εἰσφέρειν*. Still, Matthiae's objections (I. S. 26) deserve great consideration; and this orthography, as it has no historic warrant, has no great claim to adoption. Schneider in Plato, and Lchm. in the N. T., write *ὥσπερ, εἰσακούειν*, etc. Hm., however, committed himself to the former method. That it is inadmissible in such words as *πρεσβύτερος, βλασφημεῖν, τελεσφορεῖν*, is obvious.

d. Of more importance than all this is the unusual mode of spelling certain words and classes of words which is found even

¹ The disputed question, whether *οὕτως* or *οὕτω* was the original spelling (for the former see Schäf. Plutarch. V. p. 219, for the latter Bttm. II. 264), and whether *ν ἐφέλκ.* really belongs to the forms to which it is annexed (see Rost, Gramm. S. 71; Krü. 30) is not relevant here.

in the manuscripts of the N. T. and has been almost without exception adopted into the text by Lchm. and Tdf. This comprehends peculiarities of Alexandrian orthography (and pronunciation). We notice the following particulars :

1. For *ἐνεκα* we find in MSS. (and in the text. rec.) several times the Ionic form *εἵνεκα* or *εἵνεκεν* (Wolf, Dem. Lept. p. 388 ; Georgi, Hierocr. I. 43 182), elsewhere *ἐνεκεν* : the last e.g. Matt. xix. 29 ; Rom. viii. 36 ; the first ^{2nd ed} Luke iv. 18 ; 2 Cor. iii. 10 ; vii. 12. The authority of good Codd. must 56 alone here decide ; cf. Poppo, Cyrop. p. xxxix and Ind. Cyrop. and W. m. Buttm. II. 369. In the N. T. at least no distinction can be fixed between the two forms ; Weber, Demosth. 403 sq. See also Bremi, exc. VI. ad Lysiam p. 443 sqq.

2. According to good MSS. even of the N. T. (e.g. Codd. [Sin. and] Cantabr.) and according to the Etymol. Mag. *ἐννεήκοντα* Matt. xviii. 12, 13 ; Luke xv. 4, 7, is better written *ἐνενήκοντα* ; see Bttm. I. 277 ; Bornem. 42 ^{8th ed} Xen. Anab. p. 47. So also *ἑατος* occurs according to good Codd. in Matt. xx. 5 ; xxvii. 45 ; Luke xxiii. 44 ; Acts x. 30, etc. ; cf. also Rinck, lucubratt. p. 33, a form very common in Greek prose authors (see Schäf. Melet. p. 32 ; Scholiast ad Apollon. Argon. 2, 788), and also found in the Rosetta Inscription, 4th line. It was preferred by Bengel, appar. ad Matt. xx. 5.

3. The Ionic form (Mtth. I. 54) *τέσσερες*, *τεσσεράκοντα* occurs several times in good Codd. (particularly Alex. [Sin.] and Ephraemi) ; e.g. Acts iv. 22 ; vii. 42 ; xiii. 18 ; Rev. xi. 2 ; xiii. 5 ; xiv. 1 ; xxi. 17, and Lchm. and Tdf. have admitted it into the text. It frequently occurs also in Codd. of the Sept. (Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 118). In these ancient documents, however, α and ε are often interchanged, and one would scarcely consent to write Matt. viii. 3 *ἐκαθερίσθη*, Luke xvii. 14 *ἐκαθερίσθησαν*, or Heb. x. 2 *κεκαθερισμένους* with Α, and the like.

4. For *βαλάντιον* in every place where it occurs, Luke x. 4 ; xii. 33 ; xxii. 35, 36, good Codd. have *βαλλάντιον*, and this Lchm. and Tdf. have printed. Also in MSS. of Greek authors we find this doubling both in *βαλλάντιον* itself (Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 100) and in its derivatives. Bekker in his Plato has adopted it. Yet see Dindorf, Aristoph. ran. 772, and Schneider, Plat. civ. I. p. 75, III. p. 38. The word *κράββατος* is but seldom written with a single β (and then mostly *κράβατος*).

5. As to *ὑποπιάζω* (*ὑποπιέζω*) for *ὑπωπιέζω* (from *ὑπώπιον*), Luke xviii. 5 ; 1 Cor. ix. 27 var., see Lob. p. 461. It is probably merely a mistake of the copyists ; for Paul undoubtedly used the more characteristic *ὑπωπιέζω* and that has now long stood in the text. Whether we should write *ἀνώγειον* or *ἀνάγειον* can hardly be determined, the authorities for each being nearly equal. The former is derived from the adv. *ἄνω*, the latter from *ἀνά* (Fr. Mr. 611). See, besides, Lob. p. 297.

6. The well-known controversy about the right way of spelling adverbs in ι or ει (Hm. Soph. Ai. p. 183 ; Sturz, opusc. p. 229 sqq.), affects the

N. T. only in regard to *πανοικί* Acts xvi. 34; cf. Plat. Eryx. 392 c.; Aesch. dial. 2, 1; Joseph. Antt. 4, 4, 4; 3 Macc. iii. 27. Bloomfield, glossar. in Aesch. Prom. p. 131 sq., is perhaps right in thinking that such adverbs from nouns in *ος* should be written with *ι* only (*πανοικί*, properly *πανοικολί*, as some Codd. have in Acts, as above). Still, nearly all the Codd. are in
57 favor of *α*; see Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 1540; Lob. 515.

7. Should we write *Δανιδ* or *Δαβιδ*? See Gersdorf, Sprachchar. I. 44, who leaves it undecided, yet adopts the spelling with *β*. The Codd. usually
44 have it abbreviated, *Διδ*, yet occasionally the older and better, where they give it at full length, have *Δανιδ* (*Δαυιδ*), as Knapp, Schulz, Fr., Tdf. have printed it. Montfaucon, Palaeograph. graec. 5, 1, decided for the latter. Lchm. has invariably *Δαυιδ*; cf. besides Bleek on Heb. iv. 7.

8. The name of Moses is written *Μωϋσης* in the principal Codd. of the N. T. (as in the Sept. and Josephus), and this has been adopted by Knapp, Schulz, Lchm., Tdf. Still, it is a question whether this properly Coptic form, which in the Sept. is justifiable, should not in the N. T. give place to the form *Μωσής*, which comes nearer the Hebrew and is certainly more
43 usual; this passed over also to the Greeks (Strabo 16, 760 sq.) and
6th c. Romans, and has been retained by Scholz. On the diaeresis in *Μωϋσης*, dropped by Lchm., see Fr. Rom. II. 313.

9. As to *Κολοσσαί* and *Κολασσαί* see the expositors on Col. i. 1. The first of these forms is found not only on the coins of that city (Eckhel, doctrina numor. vett. I. III. 147), but also in the best Codd. of the classics (cf. Xen. Anab. 1, 2, 6); hence it was preferred by Valckenaer, ad Her. 7, 30. In the N. T., however, the form with *α* has more authority, and has been adopted by Lchm. and Tdf. It exhibits probably the popular pronunciation.

10. For *ἐννεός* Acts ix. 7, it is better to write *ἐνεός* (cf. *ἀνεως*), agreeably to the best Codd.

11. The un-Attic form *οὐθείς*, *οὐθέν*, is found altogether in the N. T. only in single though good Codd., Luke xxiii. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 2 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 8; Acts xv. 9; xix. 27: *μηθέν* Acts xxiii. 14; xxvii. 33; see Lob. Phryn. p. 181 sq. It occurs also in the Sept. (Bornem. Act. p. 115) and in Greek papyrus rolls.

12. *ἐρύθη* 1 Cor. v. 7, text. rec., for which all the better Codd. have *ἐρύθη* (Bttm. I. 78), is unusual, but rests on an unexceptionable retaining of the radical *θ* where there is no reduplication (*λιθωθῆναι*, *καθορθῆναι*), though both the verbs *θύειν* and *θεῖναι* (the only ones of which the stem begins with *θ* and which form a 1st Aor.) change the radical *θ* in the 1st Aor. into *τ* (Lob. Paralip. 45). The participle *θυθείς*, analogous in form to the above example, occurs in Dio Cass. 45, 17. (In Aesch. Choëph. 242, the editions have *τυθείς*.) It is not improbable that the first form was employed by Paul, and suppressed by the copyists.

13. For *χρεωφειλέτης* the best Codd. have *χρεοφειλέτης* Luke vii. 41;

xvi. 5, which Zonaras rejects, and it occurs only once in the MSS. of Greek authors ; see Lob. Phryn. p. 691.

14. The rough mutes for the smooth in *ἐφίδε* Acts iv. 29, and *ἀφίδω* Phil. ii. 23, Lchm. has already adopted on the authority of MSS. Other similar forms are *ἐφ' ἐλπίδι* 1 Cor. ix. 10 ; *ἀφελπίζοντες* Luke vi. 35 ; *οὐχ ὄψεσθε* Luke xvii. 22 ; *οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς* Gal. ii. 14 ; *οὐχ ὀλίγος* Acts xii. 18, etc., (cf. Bornem. Acta, p. 24). Analogous forms occur in the Sept. 58 (Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 127) and in Greek inscriptions (Böckh, Inscript. I. 301, and II. 774), and are explained by the fact that many of those words, as *ἐλπίς*, *ιδεῖν*, had been pronounced with the digamma.

15. *Πραῦς* and *πραΐτης* appear in the N. T. to be the better attested readings, though Photius, in his Lexicon, p. 386, Lips., prefers *πρᾶος* ; yet 45 see Lob. Phryn. p. 403 sq. 7th ed.

16. *Ἐχθές* (not *χθές*, Lob. path. p. 47) Lchm. has already received into the text, agreeably to the best Codd.

2. Whether such words as *διὰ τί, ἵνα τί, διὰ γε, ἀλλά γε, ἀπ' ἄρτι, τοῦτ' ἔστι* should be written separate or united, can hardly be determined on any general principle ; and the matter is of the less moment as the best Codd. themselves vary extremely. Knapp has printed most such words combined ; and, in fact, two small words in expressions of frequent recurrence are wont readily to blend thus in pronunciation (as the crases in *διό, διότι, καθά, ὥστε*, 44 also *μηκέτι* and others, show). Schulz, on the contrary, defends 6th ed. their separation. Would he write also *εἴ γε, τοι νῦν, οὐκ ἔτι*, etc. ? How much the Codd. in the main favor their junction may be seen from Poppo, Thuc. I. p. 455. Schulz himself, too, has printed *διαπαντός* Mark v. 5, Luke xxiv. 53 ; and Schneider in his Plato follows almost invariably the united mode of writing them. Many inconveniences, however, would arise from carrying out strictly either mode of writing ; and as the oldest and best Codd. of the N. T. are written continuously, thus affording no guidance on this point, it would probably be advisable constantly to combine such words in the N. T. in the following cases : a. Where the language supplies an obvious analogy, e.g. *οὐκέτι* like *μηκέτι, τουγάρ* like *τοιάνν, ὅστις* cf. *ὅτου*. b. Where one of the words does not elsewhere occur separately (in prose) ; therefore, *εἶπερ, καίπερ*. c. When an enclitic follows a monosyllable or dissyllable with which it usually constitutes a single idea, as *εἶτε, εἵγε, ἄραγε* ; but not *διάγε τὴν ἀναδειαν* Luke xi. 8 (Lchm. divides). d. Where the words have a different signification according as they are separated or united ; as, *ὅστις οὖν quicumque*, but *ὅς τις οὖν* Matt. xviii. 4 *quisquis igitur* (Bttm. I. 308), *ἐξ αὐτῆς* adv. and *ἐξ αὐτῆς* (not to mention *οὐδέls*

and οὐδ' εἰς). The former οὐν, however, is usually found disunited in the Codd., and by the authors themselves is sometimes separated by the interposition of a conjunction; see Jacobs, *praef. Aelian. anim.* p. 25. As for the rest, much must be left to the editor's judgment in each particular instance. However, he could hardly find clear ground for writing διαπαντός, or even ὑπερεγώ (2 Cor. xi. 23, *Lehm.*) and the like; although in general it must not be forgotten that in the language of the N. T., as closely approaching popular speech, orthographic combinations are especially frequent.

In the editions of the N. T. the pronoun ὃτι was invariably so written (with the hypodiatole), Luke x. 35; Jno. ii. 5; xiv. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; etc., till *Lehm.*, after Bekker, introduced ὃ τι (as ὃς τις, ἡ τις). Some think even this separation unnecessary (as Schneider, *Plat. civ. I. praef.* p. 48 sq.); cf. *Jen. Lit. Z.* 1809, IV. 174. The non-separation, besides other recommendations, has in its favor the consideration that an arbitrary exposition of the text is not forced upon the reader. (In the N. T. particularly it has often been doubtful which of the two is to be read, as Jno. viii. 25; Acts ix. 27; 2 Cor. iii. 14.) Once, however, we decide between pron. and conj., it is safest to write ὃ τι with a space, or even to retain the hypodiatole.

3. Crasis¹ occurs on the whole but seldom, and only in particular forms of frequent recurrence. In these, however, it is found almost without var. The most common instances are κἀγώ, κἄν, κἀκεῖ, κἀκεῖθεν, κἀκεῖνος, also κἀμοί, Luke i. 3; Acts viii. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 1; xv. 8; κἀμέ, Jno. vii. 28; 1 Cor. xvi. 4; τοῦναντίον, 2 Cor. ii. 7; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 9; once τοῦνομα, Matt. xxvii. 57. On the other hand, good Codd. have throughout τὰ αὐτά, Luke vi. 23; xvii. 30; 1 Thess. ii. 14. Instances like τουτέστι, καθά, καθάπερ, are not properly called crasis.

Contraction, where usual, is rarely neglected; cf. on ὄστεα, χειλέων, νοί, and the like §§ 8 and 9, besides ἐδέετο, Luke viii. 38, according to the best Codd., cf. *Fr. de conform. crit.* p. 32, as often in Xenoph. See *Bttm.* II. 150; Lob. 220. The verb καμμύειν exhibits a contraction of a peculiar sort; cf. Lob. 340.

There is good authority for καὶ ἐκεῖ, Matt. v. 23; xxviii. 10; Mark i. 35, 38; καὶ ἐκείθεν, Mark x. 1; καὶ ἐκείνους, Matt. xx. 4, etc.

4. In the earlier editions of the N. T. the Iota subscript [²] was too frequently introduced. This abuse was first censured by Knapp. The iota must be decidedly rejected:

¹ *Ahrens*, de crasi et aphaeresi. Stollberg, 1845. 4to.

[² Cf. *K. H. A. Lipsius*, *grammat. Unterss. über die biblische Gräcität.* Leipzig. 8vo. α. α.]

a. In cases of crasis with *καί* when the first syllable of the second word does not contain an *ι* (as *κᾶτα* from *καὶ εἶτα*), therefore in *κἀγώ*, *κἀμοί*, *κἀκεῖνος*, *κᾶν*, *κἀκεῖ*, *κἀκεῖθεν*, etc. See Hm. Vig. p. 526; Bttm. I. 114. The *ι* subs., however, is defended by Thiersch, Gr. § 38 note 1, and Poppo has retained it in Thucyd. after the best MSS. (Thuc. II. I. p. 149).

b. In the 2d perf. and 1st aor. act. of the verb *αἶρω* and its compounds, thus e.g. *ἤρκεν* Col. ii. 14; *ἄραι* Matt. xxiv. 17; *ἄρον* Matt. 60 ix. 6; *ἤραν* Matt. xiv. 12; *ἄρας* 1 Cor. vi. 15, etc. See Bttm. I. 413, 439; Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 150.

c. In the Doric Inf., used also by the Attics (Mtth. I. 148), *ζῆν*, *διψῆν*, *πεινῆν*, *χρῆσθαι*. According to ancient grammarians¹ (who flourished after Christ) the iota ought to be rejected also in contract verbs in *άω*; as *ἀγαπᾶν*, *ὀρᾶν*, *τιμᾶν*, probably inasmuch as these forms arose from (the Doric) *τιμάειν*, like *μισθοῦν* from *μισθόειν*; see Wolf in the lit. Analekten 1 Bd. S. 419 ff. Bengel^{7th ed.} favored this form, and it has been defended and followed by several scholars (Reiz, Lucian. IV. p. 393 sq. ed. Bp.; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. v. 69, and praef. ad Soph. Oedip. R. p. 9 sq.; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 14 sq.). Bttm. I. 490, and Mtth. I. 437, declare themselves undecided, and many editors have retained the old mode of writing (as Lobeck, cf. his technol. p. 188). Schulz, Lchm. and Tdf., however, have rejected the *ι* subs. from the N. T.; cf. Eph. v. 28; Rom. xiii. 8; Mark viii. 32; John xvi. 19.

d. There is nothing decisive for *πρῶτος* (Lob. Phryn. 403; pathol. serm. gr. p. 442), yet see Bttm. I. 255. Neither has *πρωτῶ*, from *πρό*, an *ι* subs.; see as to this word in general, Bttm. ad Plat. Crit. p. 43, and Lexilog. 17, 2.

e. As to *πάντη* Acts xxiv. 3, see Bttm. II. 360. The *ι*, which has a right to stand in *ἄλλῃ*, *ταύτῃ*, as actual Datives, should be rejected in *πάντῃ*, which has no corresponding Nom. The old⁴⁶ grammarians, however, are of a different opinion (Lob. paralip. 6th ed. 56 sq.), and Lchm. has printed *πάντῃ*. Also *κρυφῇ* (Dor. *κρυφᾷ*) Eph. v. 12, cf. Xen. conv. 5, 8, and *εἰκῇ* (Bttm. II. 342) have been received into the N. T. text; cf. Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 150. Lchm. still writes *λάβρα*, though *λάβρα* is more correct; Schneider, Plat. civ. I. p. 61 praef.; Ellendt, lex. Soph. II. p. 3 sq. Lastly,

f. Since Lchm. *ἀθῶν* stands in the text of the N. T. Matt. xxvii. 4, 24 (*ἀθώιον*, Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 1267), cf. also Weber,

¹ Cf. Vig. p. 220. See also Gregor. Choerobosc. Dictata ed. Gaisford, tom. II. p. 721. Yet see Hm. Vig. 748.

Demosth. p. 231 ; but contrary to all tradition, Lob. pathol. graec. serm. p. 440.¹

After the example of Bekker and others, Lchm. began, in the larger edition of his N. T., to reject the breathings over double ρ as useless ; but he has found no followers [except Tdf. ed. vii.]. That the Romans also heard an aspiration in the middle of words is clear from the orthography of Pyrrhus, Tyrrenus, etc. Btm. I. S. 28. Still less can one bring one's self to omit the breathing also over ρ at the beginning of a word, as some
61 do ; see in opposition Rost, Gramm. S. 17 f. [or, as Lchm. does, to mark with a *smooth* breathing the first ρ in words the first two syllables of which begin with ρ ; see in opposition Götting, Accentl. p. 205].

The Alexandrians (Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 116 sqq.) had, as it is admitted, their peculiar Greek orthography, which not only interchanged letters (as αι and ει, ε and η, ι and ει, cf. εἶδα Matt. xxviii. 3, γ and κ), but even added superfluous ones, to strengthen the forms of words ; as, ἐκθές, βασιλείαν, νύκταν, φθάνειν, ἐκχυνόμενον, ἔσπειρε, ἀναβαίνων, ἡλλατο (Acts xiv. 10 ; vii. 26 ; cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 210). On the other hand, necessary
48 letters (when doubled) they rejected ; as, δυσσεβής, σάβασι, ἀντάλαγμα, φύλα, 7th ed. ἐρύσατο, ἀραφος (Jno. xix. 23). They disregarded, too, the methods by which the Greeks avoided a harsh concurrence of many or of dissimilar consonants (Btm. I. 75 ff.) ; as, λήμφομαι, ἀναλημφθείς (Btm. II. 231), προσωποληψία, ἀπεκτάνασι, ἐνχώριον, συνκάλυμμα, συνρητεῖν, συνπνίγειν, συμμαθητής, πένπει. These peculiarities are found, partly in good MSS. of the Sept. and of the N. T. (Tdf. praef. ad N. T. p. 20 sq. [ed. vii. p. 46 sqq.]) which are said to have been executed in Egypt, e.g. Cod. Alex., [Cod. Sin.], Cod. Vatic., Cod. Ephraem. (ed. Tdf. p. 21), Cod. Cantabr., Cod. Claromont. (Tdf. prolegg. ad cod. Clarom. p. 18), Cod. Cypr. (see Hug, Einleit. I. S. 238, 242, 244, 245, 247, 249, 254 ; Scholz, curae crit. in hist. text. evangg. pp. 40, 61) ; partly in Coptic and Graeco-Coptic documents (see Hug. I. 239), with more or less uniformity. They cannot, therefore, be dismissed as but caprices of the copyists, as Planck thinks (de orat. N. T. indole, p. 25, note), especially as for many of them analogies can be adduced from the older dialects. At the same time, many of them are not specially Alexandrian, as the like occur in Codd. of Greek authors, and in Greek inscriptions, that cannot be traced to an Egyptian origin ; as, e.g.
47 ει for ι, εγ for εκ, (on λήμφομαι cf. the Ion. λάμφομαι Mth. 609) ; and, on 6th ed. the other hand, many Egyptian documents are tolerably free from the peculiarities in question.

Lchm. and Tdf., on the concurrent testimony of good (but for the most part few) Codd. in Matt. xx. 10 ; xxi. 22 ; Mark xii. 40 ; Luke xx. 47 ;

¹ The spelling φόν (*Wessel*, Her. 2, 68), ζφον, which *Jacobs*, in Aelian. animal., recently adopted on the authority of a good Cod., nobody will be disposed to introduce into the N. T. ; still less υφζεν. Cf. Lob. pathol. p. 442.

Acts i. 2, 8, 11, 22; Jas. i. 7; Mark i. 27; 2 Cor. vii. 8; Phil. ii. 25, etc. (sometimes without giving authorities, Matt. xix. 29; John xvi. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 14; Phil. iii. 12; Rom. vi. 8, etc.), have received these forms into the text. Without more convincing proof, however, than what has been produced by Tdf. *praef. ad. N. T.* p. 19 [ed. vii. p. 45] all the peculiarities of the Alex. dialect, and in particular of the Alex. orthography, should not be attributed to Palestinean writers, (as John, Paul, James); and it is improbable that the N. T. writers should have followed that orthography only in comparatively few instances.¹ Besides, Cod. B in reference to this point has not yet been thoroughly collated. According to what Tdf. has said, as above, p. 21, he might have been expected to adopt such forms more frequently.

The introduction, therefore, of this orthography into the text of the N. T.—if editors choose to imitate on such points the Codd., even in editions intended for general use—must undergo renewed and thorough consideration; and at the same time the question may be raised, whether this orthography was not a mode of spelling adopted by the learned rather than the actual pronunciation of the people, somewhat as in Roman inscriptions (Schneider, *lat. Grammat.* I. II. 530 f., 543 f., 566 f. etc.) we find *adferre*, *inlatus*, and the like, written according to the etymology.

§ 6. ACCENTUATION. [1]

1. The accentuation of the text of the N. T. is to be regulated, not so much by the authority of the oldest accented Codd. [to which Lipsius, as above, has attached too much importance], as by the established tradition of the grammarians; though much still remains doubtful, and, in the minute researches of later critics, attempts have sometimes been made to introduce subtleties. We select the following observations:

a. According to the ancient grammarians (Moeris, p. 193), *ἰδε* should be written *ἰδέ* in Attic authors only, and *ἴδε* in the remaining (later) writers; just as *λαβέ* and *λάβε* are distinguished, Weber, Demosth. p. 173, cf. Bttm. I. 448. Griesb. has so printed (except in Gal. v. 2), and Lehm. everywhere. According to Bornem.'s conjecture (Rosenmüller, *exeg. Repert.* II. 267), the word should be written *ἰδέ* when it occurs as an Imper. followed by an Acc. (Rom. xi. 22), and *ἴδε* when it is merely an exclamation. It is preferable, however, to follow the ancient grammarians.

¹ Of many words, as *συλλαμβάνειν*, *συλλαλεῖν*, *συμβούλιον*, *συμπιπτεῖν*, no such form at all has been observed; of others, as *συλλέγειν*, *συγκαλεῖν*, *συσταυροῦν*, *ἐγκαλεῖν*, only in single passages.

[² Cf. Lipsius, *gramm. Unterss.* tib. d. bibl. Gräcität. S. 14 ff. S. 33 ff.]

b. Numerals compounded with ἔτος should have the accent on the penult, according to the ancient grammarians (Thom. M. 859; 48 Moschopul. in Sched.), when they are used of *time*; in every other 6th ed. case, on the last. Hence Acts vii. 23 τεσσαρακονταέτης χρόνος, and Acts xiii. 18 τεσσαρακονταέτη χρόνον; on the other hand, ἑκατονταετής, Rom. iv. 19 (cf. Jacobs, Anthol. III. p. 251, 253). This distinction, however, is not observed in the MSS., and the whole rule is doubtful, see Lob. 406 sq. Ammonius, p. 136, exactly reverses the distinction; see Bremi, Aeschin. Ctesiph. 369, ed. Goth.

c. Some would have κήρυξ and φοῖνιξ accented κήρυξ and φοῖνιξ (see Schäf. Gnom. p. 215 sq. and Soph. Philoct. 562, cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 956 sq.) on the ground that, according to ancient grammarians, the υ and ι (in the Nom. Sing.) were pronounced 63 short (Bekker, Anecd. III. 1429). Hm., Soph. Oed. R. p. 145, rejects this as contrary to all analogy. Yet it is a question whether in later Greek the accentuation κήρυξ, φοῖνιξ is not to be preferred with the grammarians; see Bttm. I. 167. Lchm. has followed it.

d. For ποῦς, as it stood in most of the older editions of the N. T., Knapp restored ποῦς, because the Gen. has ποδός with short ο; see Lob. Phryn. 765, and paralip. 93.

e. Griesb. and others have incorrectly written λαῖλαψ; it should 50 be λαῖλαψ, as the α is short. In the same way, Schulz (though 7th ed. not invariably) and Lchm. write θλίψις for θλίψις (as λήψις), because the first ι is long, not by position, but by nature. So κλίμα, κρίμα, χρίσμα, μῆγμα, ψύχος (cf. Reisig, de constr. antistr. p. 20; Lob. paralip. 418), στῦλος (Passow, under the word), (ρίψις and) ῥίψαν Luke iv. 35. However, it has been rightly remarked by Fr., Rom. I. 107, that as according to the testimony of the ancient grammarians (Lob. Phryn. 107; cf. Dindorf, praef. ad Aristoph. Acharn. p. 15) the later Greeks in many words shortened the penult which was long in Attic, this return to Attic accentuation in the N. T. is not so unquestionably warranted. No editor [except Tdf. ed. vii.] has changed the regular θρήσκος into θρησκός, though several Codd. so read; see Bengel, app. crit. ad Jac. i. 26.

f. Since the termination αι is considered as short in accentuation (Bttm. I. 54), we must write θυμιάσαι Luke i. 9, and κηρύξαι Luke iv. 19; Acts x. 42, for θυμιάσαι and κηρύξαι (as still written by Knapp); cf. Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 151; Bornem. schol. p. 4. Griesb. and Knapp, in Acts xii. 14, still write erroneously ἐστάναι, as α is short. On the other hand συντετριφθαι Mark v. 4 has already been restored.

g. In the older editions, even in Knapp's, *ἐριθεία* is written *ἐρίθεια*; but, as the word is derived from *ἐριθεύω*, the former accentuation is alone admissible; see Bttm. I. 141, II. 401. So *ἀρεσκέα*, since it comes from *ἀρεσκεύειν* and not *ἀρέσκειν*, must not be accented *ἀρέσκεια* (as both Lchm. and Tdf. accent it).

h. Lchm., agreeably to the undoubted analogy of *γνώστης*, *κλάστης*, etc., changed *κτιστή* 1 Pet. iv. 19 (Knapp and Griesb.) into *κτίστη*. But Schott and Wahl have retained *κτιστή*; yet see Beng. appar. p. 442.

i. As to *μσθωτός* see Schäf. Dem. II. p. 88. The word *φάγος*, 49 Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34, is so accented even in other books besides the N. T., Lob. Phryn. 484, though from analogy we should expect *φαγός*, Lob. paralip. 135, who decides against Fr. Mr. p. 790 sqq.

k. Lob. Phryn. 348, and Bttm. exc. I. ad Plat. Menon. hold 64 that we should write *εἶπον* 1st Aor. Imp. Acts xxviii. 26, and not *εἰπόν*; yet see reasons worthy of consideration on the other side by Wex, in the Jahrb. für Philol. VI. 169. The former accentuation is limited to standard Attic. For *εἰπόν* in the Greek Bible, see the express testimony of Charax in Bttm. as above, who calls the accentuation Syracusan. The later editors have also retained this form. See, besides, Bornem. Acta, p. 234 sq.

l. Names of Persons, originally oxytone adjectives or appellatives, throw back the accent for the sake of distinction;¹ thus, *Τύχικος* not *Τυχικός*, *Ἐπαινέτος* not *Ἐπαινετός* (Lob. paral. 481), *Φίλητος* 51 not *Φιλητός* (see Bengel app. crit. on the passage), *Ἐραστός* not *Ἐραστός*, *Βλάστος* not *Βλαστός*, *Κάρπος* not *Καρπός*, [*Πύρρος* not *Πυρρός*, *Ἐρμογένης*,] *Σωσθένης* (like *Δημοσθένης*) and *Διοτρέφης* 3 Jno. 9. In the same way we write *Τίμων* for *Τιμών*, *Ὀνησίφορος* for *Ὀνησιφόρος*, *Εὐμένης* for *Εὐμενής*. On the other hand *Τμέναιος* remains unaltered, as in general there is a reluctance to throw forward the accent in proper names. Hence even proparoxytones, as *Τρόφιμος*, *Ἀσύγκριτος*, [*Εὐτυχος*] retain their accent, Lob. as above. Yet those former examples also occur exceptionally with their original accent in ancient grammarians and in good Codd. (cf. Tdf. prolegg. Cod. Clarom. p. 22; cf. also *Φιλητός* in Euseb. H. E. 6, 21, 2); and the name *Χριστός* was never brought under the preceding rule. See, generally, Reiz de incl. accent. p. 116; Schäf. Dion. H. p. 265; Funkhänel, Demosth. Androt. p. 108 sq.;

¹ So also geographical names; see Nobbe, schedae Ptolem. II. (Lips. 1842. 8vo.) p. 17 sq.

particularly *Lehrs, de Aristarchi studiis Homer. p. 276 sq.* (In the same way also *ἐπέκεινα, ἐπίταδε, ὑπερέκεινα* were accented, when these forms, compounded of *ἐπ' ἐκείνα*, etc., were used as adverbs.)

m. Indeclinable oriental names are regularly accented on the last; (cf. however, *Ἰούδα, Θάμαρ, Ζοροβάβελ, Ἰωάθαμ, Ἐλεάζαρ*, and the segholate form *Ἐλιέζερ* Luke iii. 29, *Ἰεζάβελ* Rev. ii. 20 according to good Codd., *Μαθουσάλα* Luke iii. 37). The accent, even on long vowels, is for the most part the acute; as, *Ἰσαάκ, Ἰσραήλ, Ἰακώβ, Γεννησάρ, Βηθσαιδά, Βηθεσδά, Ἐμμαούς, Καφαρναούμ*. On the other hand, the MSS. have *Κανᾶ, Γεθσημανῇ* (though there is more authority for *Γεθσημανεῖ*, which Lchm. and Tdf. prefer; see Fr. Mr. p. 626), also *Βηθφαγῇ* (cf. also *Νινευῇ*). Names which occur as indeclinable and as oxytone, Josephus, with whom declension predominates, makes barytone; as, *Ἀβία* (in the N. T. *Ἀβιά*). The oldest MSS. are said (Tdf. prolegg. p. 36 [ed. vii. p. 61]) to give *Πιλᾶτος*, not *Πιλᾶτος*, as it is usually written 65 even by Lchm. (and by Cardwell in his ed. of Joseph. bell. jud.). Yet even recent editors, agreeably to the Codd., write *Κοριολάνος* 50 (Plutarch. Coriol. c. 11; Dion. H. 6, p. 414, Sylb.), *Κικιννάτος* (Dion. H. 10, p. 650), *Τορκουάτος* (Plut. Fab. Max. c. 9; Dio C. 34, c. 34), *Κοδράτος* (Quadratus) Joseph. antt. 20, 6, *Ονοράτος*, etc. As to *Τίτος* and *Τίτος* see Sinten. Plut. vit. II. 190. For *Φήλιξ*, not *Φήλιξ*, see Bornem. Acta, p. 198.

The accentuation *ὁμοίως, ἐρήμος, ἐτοίμος, μῶρος* (Boisson. Anecd. V. p. 94), which grammarians (Greg. Cor. p. 12, 20 sqq.) refer to the Ionians and earlier Attics, and which Bekker for instance follows, is certainly inadmissible even in Attic prose (Poppo, Thuc. I. 213. II. I. 150; Bttm. I. 55); still more so in the N. T. On the other hand, we must without doubt 52 invariably write *ἴσος*; cf. Bornem. Luke, p. 4; Fr. Mr. p. 649. The N. T. 7th ed. MSS. have uniformly *ἴσω* for *εἴσω*, though they have always *εἰς* and never *ἐς*. Thuc., on the other hand, who mostly uses *ἐς*, has *εἴσω* 1, 134; see Poppo, I. p. 212. Recent editors reject *ἴσω* in Attic prose; see Schneider, Plat. civ. I. praef. p. 53. (As to the poets, see Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 84 sq. Lips.) As to whether we should write in Jas. i. 15 *ἀποκνῆ* or *ἀποκνῆι*, see below, § 15 p. 88.

In regard to the dim. *τεκνίον* as paroxytone, like *τεχνίον* in Athen. 2. 55, see Bttm. II. 441.; later editors, however, prefer *τέχνιον* in Athen. and Plat. rep. 6. 495 d. In the N. T. the only part of *τεκνίον* that occurs is the Plur. *τεκνία*; see Janson in Jahn's Archiv VII. 487. *Ποίμνιον* (from *ποιμένιον*) should be unhesitatingly preferred to *ποιμνίον*, Janson as above, 507. On *ἀδροτής, βραδυτής* as oxytones, see Bttm. II. 417. This accord-

ing to the grammarians is the old accentuation, an exception to the rule; Lchm. has, on the other hand, ἀδρότητι 2 Cor. viii. 20, but βραδυτήτα 2 Pet. iii. 9. The later Greeks seem to have pronounced these words regularly as paroxytones; Reiz, *accent. inclin.* p. 109. On οὔκουν and οὐκοῦν, ἀρα and ἀρα, see § 57, 3, pp. 510, 512.

2. Many forms, as is well known, of the same spelling but differing in meaning, are distinguished from each other by the accents; as, εἰμί *sum* and εἴμι *eo* (μύριοι *ten thousand* and μυρίοι *innumerable*, Bttm. I. 278). The accented Codd. and even the editors of the N. T. sometimes waver between these two modes of accentuation. Thus for μένει 1 Cor. iii. 14, Chrysost., Theod., Vulg., etc., read μενεῖ (Fut.), which Knapp and Lchm. have admitted into the text, cf. v. 13; Heb. i. 11. In Heb. iii. 16, there is more authority for τίνες than τινές, and accordingly recent critics have almost unanimously preferred the former. For ὥσπερ ἐκ τῷ ἐκτρώματι 1 Cor. xv. 8, some Codd. have ὥσπερ ἐκ τῷ i. e. τινι ἐκτρώματι, which Knapp has unnecessarily admitted into the text, (it is clearly the correction of persons who took offence at the use of the article here, and besides, has but little authority in its favor); 66 so in 1 Thess. iv. 6 ἐν τῷ πράγματι, just as unnecessary. In 1 Cor. x. 19, many recent editors write ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτον τί ἐστίν, ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλον τί ἐστίν (Knapp and Mey.), because there is an emphasis on τι (antithetic to οὐδέν), and the other accentuation εἰδωλόθυτόν τι ἐστίν (Lchm.) produces ambiguity, since this might signify: *that there is anything offered to idols*. Yet even supposing the 51 former interpretation unquestionable, it is not necessary to reject ^{the old} the usual accentuation, in so far as it gives the sense: that an offering to idols *is* something (not only *appears to be*, but *is* in reality). Critics still contend about the accentuation of John vii. 34, 36, ὅπου εἰμι ἐγώ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν or ὅπου εἴμι ἐγώ, etc. (as several Fathers and versions read); and in Acts xix. 38 almost all recent editors have accented ἀγόραιοι (adj. signifying *judicial*) instead of ἀγοραῖοι. With regard to the first of these passages, John's use of language (xii. 26; xiv. 3; xvii. 24) gives 53 the preference to εἰμί (see Lücke on the passage, after Knapp, ^{7th ed.} comm. isagog. p. 32 sq.); but in the second, the acute would probably be correct, if we listen to Suidas, and with Kulencamp read in Ammon. p. 4: ἀγόραιος μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα, ἀγοραῖος δὲ ὁ Ἑρμῆς ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς; cf. Lob. paralip. p. 340.

In the same way we must decide on Rom. i. 30, where some taking the word as active accent it θεοστυγής, because θεοστυγεῖς

must mean *Deo exosi*; but the analogy of adjectives like *μητρόκτονος* and *μητροκτόνος* (Bttm. II. 482) proves nothing respecting adjectives in *ης*. Besides, Suidas says expressly that *θεοστυγείς* means both *οἱ ὑπὸ θεοῦ μισούμενοι* and *οἱ θεὸν μισούντες*; (though he distinguishes *θεομισής* from *θεομίσης* in signification). The form *θεοστυγείς*, which alone is according to analogy, (compound adjectives in *ης* being oxytones,) is consequently the only correct form. As to the active sense of the word, however, Suidas does not appear to have quoted it as Greek usage, but only to have adopted it in the preceding passage of Paul. At least, this meaning of the word cannot be positively established from any Greek author; see Fr. Rom. I. 84 sqq. To be sure, the word occurs but a few times in all. On the other hand, there is good ground for the distinction between *τροχός* (*wheel*), which the text and the accented Codd. have in James iii. 6, and *τρόχος* (*race*), as according to Grotius, Hottinger, Schulthess, etc., it should be read (see Schäf. Soph. II. 307). The figure *τροχός γενέσεως* (joined to *φλογίζουσα*) is neither incorrect, nor in James particularly strange; accordingly, no alteration of the accent is required.

In regard to other passages where alterations of accent have been proposed, as 1 Cor. xiv. 7 (*ὁμῶς* for *δμως*), Col. i. 15 (*πρωτοτόκος* for *πρωτότοκος*, see Mey.), or even James i. 17, *πατήρ τῶν φωτῶν* for *φώτων*, these proposals have originated partly in doctrinal prejudices, partly in ignorance of the language. The last is positively absurd.

3. It is still an unsettled question whether in prose (for to poetry peculiar considerations apply, cf. e.g. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 476) the enclitic forms of the pronoun, where no emphasis is intended, should be joined to a preposition: whether, for instance, we should write *παρά σου, ἐν μοι, εἰς με*, and not *παρά σου, ἐν ἐμοί*, etc. In the editions of the N. T., even in Lchm.'s (and elsewhere also in Greek books), we constantly find *πρός με, πρόσ σε*, but *ἐν σοί, ἐν ἐμοί, ἐπὶ σέ, εἰς ἐμέ, ἐπ' ἐμέ*, etc.; and only in connection with those enclitic forms in a few passages, Luke i. 43; Acts xxii. 8, 13; xxiii. 22; xxiv. 19; cf. Bornem. on the last passage, (mostly at the end of a sentence) from Cod. B and some others the orthotoned pronouns are noted as various readings. Partly on the authority of ancient grammarians, and partly for the reason laid down by Hm. emend. gr. gr. I. 75 sq. that in such combinations the pronoun has the force of a noun, one must be disposed to decide generally for the orthotoned form; (only *πρός με* is defended by a portion of the grammarians, and occurs frequently in Codd.) see also Bttm.

I. 285 f. ; Jacobs, Anthol. Pal. I. praef. p. 32 ; Mtth. Eurip. Orest. 384, Sprachl. I. 110 ; Krü. 76 ; also Ellendt, Arrian. I. 199. Yet Reisig, conject. in Aristoph. p. 56, and Bornem. Xen. conviv. p. 163, decide otherwise ; and it must be confessed that good MSS. of Greek authors (even besides the case of *πρὸς με*) often have the enclitic forms. Where the pronoun is emphatic, the enclitic forms of course do not occur ; accordingly Knapp and Schulz properly give Jno. xxi. 22, *τί πρὸς σέ*.

In editions of the N. T. text, the enclitic forms are in general employed agreeably to the established rules of grammarians ; hence even Fr., notwithstanding Hermann's authority (emend. rat. I. 71, 73), still writes *ὁ παῖς μου* (Matt. viii. 6), *ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες* (Jno. vi. 64), *ὑπὸ τινων* (Luke ix. 7), and not *παῖς μοῦ*, *ἐξ ὑμῶν τινές*, *ὑπὸ τινῶν*. Lchm.¹ began to accent the pronoun in the last two instances, and also to write *ποῦ ἔστιν*, Matt. ii. 2 ; *μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστιν*, Mark ii. 19 ; but *παῖς μου* he left unchanged. He has been followed by Tdf. See, however, the judicious decision of Btm. I. 65 f.

§ 7. PUNCTUATION.²

68

1. In all editions of the N. T. down to that of Griesbach inclusive, the punctuation was not only deficient in consistency, but also suffered from the mistake that in order to facilitate the understanding of the text editors punctuated too much, especially with commas. In this way, too, they forestalled the reader and imparted to the text their own exegetical views ; cf. also Btm. I. 68 ; Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 76.

The first person who directed keener attention to punctuation, 53 and attempted to reduce it to fixed principles, was Knapp. He ^{6th ed.} has been followed, and with additional restrictions, by Schulz, Lchm., and Tdf. (the last adhering mostly to Lchm.).³ None of them, however, gave a general exposition of his principles.⁴ 55

Punctuation was originally contrived as an aid in reading, espe- ^{7th ed.} cially in reading aloud, by marking the various resting-places for

¹ Yet he (Lchm.) has printed in Acts xxvii. 44, *ἐν τινων* ; Jno. xx. 23, *ἐν τινων*.

² Cf. in particular *Poppo*, in the Allg. Lit. Zeit. 1826. 1 B. S. 506 ff. ; *Mth.* I. 172 ff. ; [*Lipsius*, as above, S. 81 ff.].

³ Among the editors of Greek authors *I. Bekker* has begun to punctuate with greater moderation and consistency, and *W. Dindorf* still more sparingly. Both, however, seem to have carried the exclusion of the comma too far.

⁴ *Rinck* has proposed (Stud. u. Krit. 1842. S. 554 f.) with regard to punctuation to return to the principles of the ancient Greek grammarians (*Villoison*, Anecd. II. 138 sqq.). This, however, would be hardly practicable.

the voice. At present, however, independently of the circumstance that punctuation is indispensable in any extended system of vocal signs, its main object is to enable the reader in the act of reading to understand correctly, so far as this depends on perceiving the connection of the words (Bttm. as above). Punctuation therefore must be regulated by the logical, or rather — since the thought is clothed in language — by the grammatical and rhetorical, relations of the words to each other. Hence it is too much to expect that the exegetical views of an editor should *in no degree whatever* be suggested by his punctuation, as he has to employ not merely commas, but colons and points of interrogation.

As to the proper use of the colon and period in the text of the N. T. there can be no reasonable doubt; for, the omission of the colon before the direct words of a speaker (Lchm. Tdf.) and the substitution of a capital letter, is an innovation for which there appears to be no sufficient ground. On the other hand, the propriety of inserting or not inserting a comma is more uncertain.

69 Thus much, however, is clear, that only a grammatically complete proposition¹ having a close connection with another proposition should be separated from it by a comma; and that for this special purpose the comma was devised. But a grammatically complete proposition comprehends not only a subject, a predicate, and a copula, — three elements that may be either expressed or understood, — but all qualifying words also which are introduced to define these main elements more precisely, and without which the

54 proposition would convey but an imperfect sense. Hence it was a mistake in Griesbach e.g. to separate the subject from the verb by a comma whenever it was accompanied by a participle or consisted

56 of a participle with adjuncts (Mark vii. 8; x. 49; Rom. viii. 5; 1 Jno. ii. 4; iii. 15). It is a mistake to divide 1 Thess. iv. 9 *περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας, οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε γράφειν ὑμῖν*, Matt. vi. 16 *μὴ γίνεσθε, ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταί* (for *μὴ γίν.* conveys by itself no idea), v. 32 *ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* (the last words contain the most essential part of the statement), xxii. 3 *καὶ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ, καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους*

¹ A grammatical proposition usually coincides with a logical, but not always. In Luke xii. 17, for instance, and in John vi. 29 (see above) we find, logically, two propositions which, however, as the second is through the relative included in the first, form grammatically but one. The same remark applies to every condensed statement in which two clauses are contracted into one. Also in 1 Tim. vi. 3, *εἰ τις ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις*, we have, logically considered, two propositions; but grammatically, they appear in this construction as only one (see above, near the close).

etc., 1 Thess. iii. 9 *τίνα γὰρ εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ὑμῶν, ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ* etc., 1 Cor. vii. 1 *καλὸν ἀνθρώπου, γυναικὸς μὴ ὑπτεσθαι*, Acts v. 2 *καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, συνειδυίης καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς*. But the notion of a complete proposition is still more comprehensive. Even a relative clause is to be considered as a part of the preceding proposition when the relative (pronoun or adverb) includes also the demonstrative, as Jno. vi. 29 *ἵνα πιστεύσητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος*, Matt. xxiv. 44 *ἢ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὧρα ὃ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. ἔρχεται*, Luke xii. 17 *ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω τοὺς καρπούς μου*; or when there is an attraction of the relative, as Luke ii. 20 *ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἤκουσαν* (cf. Schäf. Demosth. II. 657); or when the relative clause is so necessary a complement to a foregoing word that both must be taken together to complete the sense, as Luke xii. 8 *πᾶς ὃς ἀν ὁμολογήσῃ*, Matt. xiii. 44 *πάντα ὅσα ἔχει*; or when the preposition is not repeated before the relative, as Acts xiii. 39 *ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε* etc., Luke i. 25.¹ So where the subject, predicate, or copula of a clause consists of several words connected by *καὶ* (or *οὐδέ*), all these words must be regarded grammatically as a compound whole, though logically they may form several clauses; as, Mark xiv. 22 *λαβὼν ὁ Ἰ. ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς*, Jno. vi. 24 *Ἰ. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*, Matt. xiii. 6 *ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος ἐκαυματίσθη καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξηράνθη* (so correctly Lchm.), 1 Tim. vi. 3; Matt. vi. 26. (Otherwise in Mark xiv. 27 *πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα*, Matt. vii. 7 *αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν*. The comma is here required, because two complete propositions are connected by *καὶ*. It is required also when two propositions are separated by *ἢ*.)

Further, the comma is to be omitted between such clauses as Luke xxiv. 18 *σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἱερουσ. καὶ οὐκ ἔγνων* etc., since they both belong together and must be read without a pause, for only in their connection do they convey the proper sense. Also Mark xv. 25 *ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν*, and Matt. viii. 8 *οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰέλθῃς*, must be written without punctuation. Finally, before *ἀλλά* the comma can be properly omitted if the following clause is incomplete, and has, as 55 it were, essential roots in the preceding; as, Rom. viii. 9 *ἡμεῖς δὲ 6th ed. οὐκ ἔστέ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι*, and 4 τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περι- 57 πατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα (where Fr. retains the comma). 7th ed.

¹ To omit the comma before every relative clause (as e.g. *Bekker* does in his edition of *Plato*), seems to me to be going too far.

2. On the other hand, we must not include too much in a grammatically complete proposition, and so omit commas where they are necessary. Hence we remark :

a. The Vocative is never a constituent part of the proposition with which it stands connected, but is to be regarded as its prelude, particularly when the proposition is in the first or third person. Hence we punctuate in Jno. ix. 2 *ῥαββί, τίς ἡμαρτεν*, Mark xiv. 36 *ἄββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι*, 2 Pet. iii. 1 ; Luke xv. 18 ; xviii. 11, etc.

b. A comma is properly put after a word which is the subject of a clause immediately following, beginning with a conjunction, and also of the principal clause ; as, Jno. vii. 31 *ὁ Χριστός, ὅταν ἔλθῃ, ... ποιήσει*. Lchm. otherwise.

c. If a grammatically complete clause be followed by a supplementary statement which might properly form a clause of itself, they must be separated by a comma ; as, Rom. xii. 1 *παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρίαν* (i.e. *ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ λογ. λ.*), 1 Tim. ii. 6 *ὁ δούς ἐάν τὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους*. So also in 71 the case of participles, etc. ; as, Col. ii. 2 *ἵνα παρακ. αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ*, Jno. ix. 13 *ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους, τὸν ποτε τυφλόν*, Rom. viii. 4 *ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν* etc., verse 20 ; Eph. i. 12.

d. When a single (logical) proposition contains a twofold construction (e.g. an anacoluthon), it must be written with a comma and read with a pause between the two parts ; as, Jno. xv. 2 *πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἔμοι μὴ φέρον καρπόν, αἶρει αὐτό*. By the addition of *αὐτό* the words *πᾶν κλῆμα καρπ.* become a *casus pendens* which is only the prelude to the proposition, and hence no one reads on without a pause. Rev. iii. 12 *ὁ νικῶν, ποιήσω αὐτὸν στύλον* etc. ; Heb. ix. 23 *ἀνάγκη τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τοῖτοις καθαρίζεσθαι*. It is quite obvious that inserted complete clauses must be separated from the principal clause by commas, Luke ix. 28 ; Acts v. 7, and elsewhere.

e. If a sentence contains *ἄσυνδέτως* (without *καί*) several words following one another in the same construction, or simply enumerated in succession, they must be separated from each other by commas ; as, 1 Pet. v. 10 *αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει* ; Luke xiii. 14 *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ἀγανακτῶν ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔλεγε*.

If the use of the comma in all the cases specified be well founded, a subordinate point, a half comma, would be desirable, to separate to the eye those words which in a continuous proposition, though they do not form, so to speak, a grammatical group, the reader might easily construe together. Thus, for instance, every one in reading Luke xvi. 10 ὁ πιστός ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστι will be apt to go wrong, as καὶ excites the expectation of a second expression co-ordinate with πιστός ἐν ἐλ. The same holds true of the following passages: Rom. iv. 14 εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, Jas. v. 12 ἦτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ, 1 Cor. xv. 47 ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, Heb. v. 12 ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον πάλιν χρεῖαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, Jno. v. 5 ἦν τις ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ, Rom. iii. 9 τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως (οὐ, πάντως). A half comma would at once remove all ambiguity. As, however, no such point exists, we might employ an ordinary comma, just as it is used in writing and print to distinguish ὅτι from οὔτι. Modern editors, however, do not punctuate at all in these passages, and this is perhaps most advisable.

3. It is on many accounts desirable that an editor's exposition of a passage should not be introduced into the text by means of punctuation. This is easily avoided where punctuation is unnecessary, as for instance in Rom. i. 17; vii. 21; Matt. xi. 11. But there are passages where punctuation—a period, a colon, a comma, or even a mark of interrogation—is indispensable, and yet cannot be employed without thereby adopting some distinct exposition of the text. In Jno. vii. 21 sq., for instance, every editor must determine whether to prefer ἐν ἔργον ἐποίησα καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε. διὰ τοῦτο Μωσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν περιτομήν etc., with Chrysost., Cyril, Euthym. Zigab., etc., or ἐν ἔργον θαυμάζετε διὰ τοῦτο. Μωσῆς etc., with Theophyl. and nearly all modern editors and expositors. The former punctuation may still be defended, not indeed on the ground that John (as Schulz has shown) usually begins but never ends a clause with διὰ τοῦτο, but if the connection is understood thus: *I have done one work, and ye are all surprised; therefore* (be it known to you) *Moses gave you*, etc.; i.e. I will remove your surprise. Ye yourselves, according to the law of Moses, perform circumcision on the Sabbath. If, now, that ceremony, extending to but one part of the body, is not a desecration of the Sabbath, then the healing, affecting as it does the entire man, will certainly be allowable also. I acknowledge, however, that the usual punctuation produces a far more simple explanation of the passage, as Lücke also has shown. Heb. xi. 1 may be punctuated ἐστὶ δὲ πίστις, ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις etc., so that the emphasis fall on

ἔστι, and thus the existence of faith, in the manner indicated by
 59 the words in apposition, is historically proved. However, it now
 7th ed. appears to me more proper to omit the comma after πίστις, so
 57 that a definition of faith is given, the correctness of which is then
 6th ed. illustrated by the succeeding historical examples; see Bleek on the
 passage. In punctuating Jno. xiv. 30 sq. expositors vary between
 ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ποιῶ. ἐγείρεσθε and οὐδέν·
 ἀλλ' ἵνα ποιῶ, ἐγείρεσθε; and in punctuating, if the text of
 the N. T. is to be punctuated at all, it will not be possible to
 evade this difference. Compare further, Rom. iii. 9; v. 16; vi. 21;
 viii. 33; ix. 5; xi. 31; 1 Cor. i. 13; vi. 4; xvi. 3; Acts v. 35
 (see Kühnöl); Heb. iii. 2; Jas. ii. 1, 4, 18; v. 3 sq.

The same reason, viz. to avoid prejudicing the reader in advance in
 favor of any one interpretation, may have been the chief motive with recent
 editors (Tdf.) for excluding from the text altogether the parenthesis, for-
 merly the source of so much abuse. Lchm. had still retained it. See
 below, § 62.

78. § 8. RARE FORMS OF THE FIRST AND SECOND DECLENSIONS.

1. Masculine proper names in *ās* of the 1st Decl. — mostly ori-
 ental, but formed in accordance with well-known Greek analogy —
 end in the Gen. Sing. uniformly in *ā*; as, Ἰωανῶ Jno. iii. 27,
 Ἰωνῶ Matt. xii. 39; Jno. i. 43, etc. Κλωπῶ Jno. xix. 25, Στεφανῶ
 1 Cor. i. 16; xvi. 15, Σκευῶ Acts xix. 14, Κηφῶ 1 Cor. i. 12, Σατανῶ
 Mark i. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 9, Ἐπαφρῶ Col. i. 7.¹

Likewise those ending in unaccented *as* make the Gen. in *a*;
 as, Καϊάφα Jno. xviii. 13, Ἄννα Luke iii. 2, Ἀρέτα 2 Cor. xi. 32
 (Joseph. antiqq. 17, 3, 2; 18, 5, 1), Βαρνάβα Gal. ii. 1; Col. iv.
 10, Ἀγρίππα² Acts xxv. 23; cf. Joseph. antiqq. 16, 2, 3; 16, 6, 7;
 20, 7, 1, etc. (Σίλα Joseph. vit. 17, Ματθεῖα Acta apocr. p. 133),
 Ἰούδα often.

The same form in proper names is often used by Attic authors;
 as, Μασκῶ Xen. An. 1, 5, 4, Γωβρύα Xen. C. 5, 2, 14, Κομάτα Theocr.
 5, 150 a., cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 156; Krü. 42; Ellendt, Arrian.
 Al. I. 83; V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 566; and on Βορρῶ, Luke
 xiii. 29, Rev. xxi. 13, especially Bttm. I. 147, 199; Bekker, Anecd.
 III. 1186.

¹ So also Θωμῶ in the Act. Thom., Λουκῶ Euseb. H. E. 3, 24, Ἐρμῶ Euseb. 3, 3.

² On the other hand, we find occasionally Ἀγρίππου in Joseph. (antt. 18, 7, 1 and 2;
 18, 8, 8, etc.) and Euseb. H. E. 2, 19. Codd. of Xenoph. also vary between Γωβρύου
 and Γωβρύα.

On the other hand, those in *as* pure have the usual Attic form (e.g. *Αιρείας*) in *ou* (Lob. prolegg. pathol. p.487 sqq.) ; *as*, *Ἀνδρέου* Mark i. 29 ; Jno. i. 45 (Joseph. antiqq. 12, 2, 3 ; Acta apocr. p. 158, 159), *Ἡλίου* Luke i. 17 ; iv. 25, *Ἡσαίου* Matt. iii. 3 ; xiii. 14 ; Acts 60 xxviii. 25 and elsewhere, *Ἰερεμίου* Matt. ii. 17 ; xxvii. 9, *Ζαχαρίου* ^{7th ed} Matt. xxiii. 35 ; Luke i. 40 and elsewhere, *Αυσανίου* Luke iii. 1, *Βαραχίου* Matt. xxiii. 35. So always in Joseph. *Ὀνίας*, *Ὀνίου* ; in other places *Τωβίου* (Geo. Syncell. chronogr. p. 164 ; but usually *Τωβία*). See, in general, Geo. Choerobosci dictata in Theodosii ^{6th ed} canon. ed. Gaisford, I. p. 42.

Several names of places that might have been declined according to the 1st Decl. are indeclinable in the N. T. ; *as*, *Κανᾶ* (Dat. Jno. ii. 1, 11 ; Acc. iv. 46), *Βηθσαϊδά*, *Βηθφαγή*, *Γολγοθᾶ*, *Ῥαμᾶ*. *Βηθαβαρᾶ* Jno. i. 28 would not come under this head, since Origen uses it as a Neut. Plur. ; recent editors have printed *ἐν Βηθανίᾳ*. *Λύδδα* is unquestionably inflected as ⁷⁴ feminine in Acts ix. 38 (*Λύδδης*), on the other hand in vs. 32 and 35 *Λύδδα* as Neut. Acc. has respectable Codd. in its favor ; cf. my RW. II. 30.

Words in *αρχος* ¹ commonly follow in the N. T. and later Greek the first declension, and end in *αρχης* ; ² *as*, *πατριάρχης* Heb. vii. 4, Plur. Acts vii. 8, 9, coll. 1 Chron. xxvii. 22, *τετράρχης* Matt. xiv. 1 ; Luke iii. 19 ; ix. 7, coll. Joseph. antiqq. 18, 7, 1, *τετράρχαι* Euseb. H. E. 1, 7, 4 ; *πολιτάρχης* Acts xvii. 6 ; *ἐθνάρχης* 2 Cor. xi. 32, coll. 1 Macc. xiv. 47, *ἐθνάρχη* 1 Macc. xv. 1, 2, *ἐθνάρχην* Joseph. antiqq. 17, 11, 4, *ἐθνάρχας* Euseb. Const. 1, 8 ; *δοσιάρχης*, hence *δοσιάρχων* Acts xix. 31, and *δοσιάρχην* Euseb. H. E. 4, 15, 11 (*Asiarcha*, Cod. Theodos. 15, 92) ; *ἐκατοντάρχης* Acts x. 1, 22 ; xxi. 32 ; xxii. 26, coll. Joseph. b. j. 3, 6, 2, *ἐκατοντάρχη* Acts xxiv. 23 ; xxvii. 31 ; Matt. viii. 13 where, however, a few Codd. have *ἐκατοντάρχη*, just as in Joseph. b. j. 2, 4, 3, *ἐκατόνταρχον* is found besides *ἐκατοντάρχην*. On the other hand, *ἐκατόνταρχος* occurs almost without var. in the following passages : Matt. viii. 5, 8 ; Luke vii. 6 ; Acts xxii. 25 ; (the Gen. Sing. Luke vii. 2, and Plur. Acts xxiii. 23, the former with the same accent and the latter with a circumflex on the last, may be cases of *ἐκατοντάρχης* also).

¹ The MSS. even of ancient Greek authors vary, indeed, between *αρχος* and *αρχης*, but later critics, in them, give the form *αρχος* the preference ; cf. *Bornem.* Xen. conv. 1, 4 ; *Poppo.* Xen. Cyrop. 2, 1, 22, p. 109. This also corresponds best with the etymology (from *ἀρχός*). So *τόπαραρχος*, Aeschyl. Choëph. 662. *Γυμνασιάρχης*, however, is undoubtedly the correct reading in Aeschin. Tim. ed. *Bremi* I. 23.

² That *this* was the predominant termination in the Apostolic age appears further from the circumstance that the Romans in rendering such words into Latin gave to them this or a similar form, when they might just as well have chosen the form in *archus*. Hence *Tetrarches*, Hirt. bell. Alex. c. 67 ; Liv. epitom. 94 ; Horat. serm. 1, 3, 12 ; Lucan. 7, 227 ; *Alabarches*, Cic. Attic. 2, 17 ; Juven. Satir. 1, 130 ; *Toparcha*, Spartian. in Hadrian. 13 ; *Patriarcha*, Tertull. de anim. c. 7, 55, and elsewhere. Cf. *Schäff.* Demosth. II. 151. Byzantine authors still more fully attest the predominance of this form.

- Finally, for *στρατοπεδάρχῃ* Acts xxviii. 16 (Const. Man. 4412, etc.) the better Codd. have *στρατοπεδάρχῃ*. Elsewhere, besides, in the Greek Bible and in authors of the first Christian centuries we find the following vouchers
- 61 for the form *αρχῆς*: *γενεσιάρχῆς* Wisd. xiii. 3, *κωμάρχῆς* Esth. ii. 3, *κυπριάρχῆς*
 1st ed. 2 Macc. xii. 2, *τοπάρχῆς* Gen. xli. 34; Dan. iii. 2, 3; vi. 7; Euseb. H. E. 1, 13, 3, *θιασάρχῆς* Lucian. peregr. 11, *μεράρχῆς* Arrian. Tact. p. 30, *φαλαγάρχῆς* ibid. p. 30, *εὐλάρχῆς* ibid. p. 50, *ἐλεφαντάρχῆς* 2 Macc. xiv. 12; 3 Macc. v. 4, 45, *ἀλαβάρχῆς* Joseph. antiqq. 19, 5, 1, *γενάρχῆς* Lycophr. 1307;
- 59 Joseph. antiqq. 1, 13, 4, *ταξιάρχῆς* Arrian. Al. 2, 16, 11; Euseb. Constant.
 6th ed. 4, 63 (though ibid. 4, 51 and 68 also *ταξιάρχος*; see Heinichen, index p. 585), *ἰλάρχῆς* Arrian. Alex. 1, 12, 11; 2, 7, 5, *συριάρχῆς* Acta apocr. p. 52, *νομάρχῆς* Papyr. Taur. p. 24, *γειτονιάρχῆς* Boisson. Anecd. V. 73. To quote from the Byzantine writers all the compounds of this kind would be endless; examples occur in almost every page. Of other compounds the form in *αρχος* is exclusively used in the N. T.; as, *χιλάρχος* in all passages (22).
- 75 On the other hand see *χιλάρχῆς* in Arrian. Al. 1, 22, 9; 7, 25, 11 (Ellendt, Arrian. II. 267), besides in Sept. Ex. xviii. 11, 25; Deut. i. 15; Num. i. 16, where we find also *δεκάδαρχος* (*δεκαδάρχει* Arrian. Tact. p. 98). In the Byzantines *κένταρχος* Cedren. 1, 705, 708, *νυκτέπαρχος* Leo Diac. 6, 2, must be considered as isolated instances.

Dialectic inflection in the 1st Decl. occurs in Acts x. 1; xxi. 31; xxvii. 1, where we find the Ionic form *σπείρης* from *σπεῖρα*, only in the first passage with some var. in the Codd. (cf. Arrian. acies contra Alanos, pp. 99, 100, 102); and in good Codd. we find *μαχαίρης* Rev. xiii. 14; Heb. xi. 34, 37, and *μαχαίρη* Rev. xiii. 10; Luke xxii. 49; Acts xii. 2 (cf. Ex. xv. 9) [like-wise *πρώρης* Acts xxvii. 30 in A and Sin., which Lchm. has adopted]; cf. also *Σαπφείρη* Acts v. 1 (Lchm. *Σαπφείρα*), and *συνειδυίης* v. 2, according to good Codd. See Mtth. I. 183.

2. In the Second Declension the following forms occur:

a. *Ἀπολλῶ* in Acc. Sing. for *Ἀπολλών* from *Ἀπολλῶς* (Acts xviii. 24) Acts xix. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 6 (the Gen. regularly *Ἀπολλῶ* 1 Cor. iii. 4; xvi. 12); cf. Bttm. I. 155, 199. Good Codd. (Bttm. I. 155; Krü. 45) have Acts xxi. 1 *τὴν Κῶ* (1 Macc. xv. 23; Joseph. antiqq. 14, 7, 2), where the usual form *τὴν Κῶν* has but little authority. However, together with *Κῶς*, *Κῶ* is found as indeclinable in Strabo 10, 489; cf. further, Duker, Thuc. 8, 41.

b. *Νοί*, as Dat. (after the 3d Decl.) of *νοῦς*, 1 Cor. i. 10; xiv. 15; Rom. vii. 25; and *νοός* as Gen. for *νοῦ*, 1 Cor. xiv. 19. Greek authors, instead of *νοί*, usually employ *νόφ*, or contr. *νῶ*. *Νοί* occurs besides only in Simplic. ad Aristot. phys. 31, 25; Philo I. 63 (Bekker, Anecd. III. p. 1196), the Byzantines (e.g. Malalas, see index in Bonn ed. Theophan. 28), and the Fathers; see Lob. Phryn. 458; Boissonade, Marin. p. 93 sq. Likewise *πλοός* Acts

xxvii. 9, as Gen. (for *πλου*), as in Arrian. peripl. p. 176; Malalas, 5, p. 94; Cinnam. p. 86; cf. Lob. as above.

c. The Vocative *θεέ* Matt. xxvii. 46 without var. (Judg. xxi. 3; Wisd. ix. 1; Acta Thom. 25, 45, 57; *Τιμόθεε* 1 Tim. i. 18; vi. 20), of which scarcely an instance is to be found in Greek authors; cf. Bttm. I. 151. Even the Sept. has usually Voc. *θεός*.

d. We find the Plur. of *δστέον* without contraction *δστέα* Luko 62 xxiv. 39, and *δστέων* Matt. xxiii. 27; Heb. xi. 22, and elsewhere. ^{7th ed.} The latter, however, occurs not very unfrequently in Greek prose: Lucian. neeyom. 15; Plat. Locr. 102 d. (cf. besides, Eurip. Orest. 404; Troad. 1177). *Ὅστέα* is more rare; cf. Plat. Locr. 100 b.; Aristot. anim. 3, 7; Menand. ed. Meineke, p. 196.

As Metaplasms we must notice:

1. *Ὁ δεσμός* Plur. *τὰ δεσμά* Luke viii. 29; Acts xvi. 26; xx. 23, only 60 once *οἱ δεσμοί* Phil. i. 13, everywhere without var. In Greek authors, ^{6th ed.} too, *δεσμοί* is more rare than *δεσμά* Thom. Mag. p. 204 (Bttm. I. 210; cf. 76 Kühnöl, ad Act. p. 558).

2. From *σάββαρον* we find only Gen. Sing. and Plur. and Dat. Sing.,¹ but the Dat. Plur. *σάββασι* (which occurs also in Meleag. 83, 4) comes, according to Passow, from a Sing. *σάββαρ*, Gen. *σάββαρος*.

3. The Masc. *σῆτος* has in the Plur. (besides *σῆτοι*) *σῆτα* Acts vii. 12 var., as often in Greek writers. (A Sing. *σῆτον* was never in use; see Schäff. Soph. Elect. 1366.) The best Codd., however, [Sin. also] give in Acts vii. 12 *σῆτία*, which has now been received into the text.

In regard to gender be it observed:

1. *λιμός* in Luke xv. 14; Acts xi. 28, according to some good Codd. (also according to a very few authorities in Luke iv. 25), is construed as Fem., agreeably to the Doric dialect (Lob. 188); cf. Malalas 3, p. 60. See Bornem. ad Acta, as above.

2. *βάρος* is Masc. in Mark xii. 26 (though not without var.), and Fem. in Luke xx. 37; Acts vii. 35, (Fr. Mr. p. 532). Compare in general, Lob. paralip. 174 sq. (*ἡ πηλός* Const. Man. 2239, 2764, etc.).

3. Instead of *δ νῶρος*, the later form, some Codd. in Rom. xi. 10 have *τὸ νῶρον*, the form used by the earlier writers; see Fr. on the passage.

¹ We find in the Sept. the Dat. Plur. also of this form, *σαββάροις* 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; viii. 13; Ezek. xlvi. 3, as well as in Joseph. antt. 16, 6, 4, together with *σάββασι*. In the N. T. it occasionally appears among the var. as in Matt. xii. 1, 12, according to good Codd.

§ 9. RARE FORMS OF THE THIRD DECLENSION.

Among these belong, 1. In the Singular :

- a. The Genitive *ἡμίσους* Mark vi. 23, from the Neut. *ἡμισυ* (used as a substantive), instead of the usual form *ἡμίσεος* ; cf. Dio Chr. 7, 99 ; Schwartz, comment. p. 652 ; Bttm. I. 191.
- b. The Dative *γήρει* (Ionic), for *γήρει* Luke i. 36 (as *οὔδει* from *οὔδος* in Homer), for which the text. recept. has *γήρα* ; cf. Ps. xci. 15 ; Sir. viii. 6 ; Theophan. p. 36, and the Fathers, e.g. Theodoret. in Ps. cxix. (ed. Hal. I. 1393) ; Fabric. Pseudepigr. II. 630, 747 ; Boissonade, Anecd. III. 19.
- c. The Accusative *ἰγυῆ* Jno. v. 11, 15 ; Tit. ii. 8 (Lev. xiii. 15.). The Attic authors use another contraction, *ἰγῶ*, but the former occurs also in Plat. Phaed. 89 d., and similar forms in other passages (Mtth. I. 288).
- 77 d. *Ἀρτέμων*, Acts xxvii. 40, has, according to A [Sin.] and several other Codd., *Ἀρτέμωνα*, which Lehm. has adopted (cf. *γλήχωνι* 63 Homer. Cerer. 209), as also Lob. Soph. Ai. p. 171, in preference 7th ed. to the usual form *Ἀρτέμωνα* : appellativi declinatio sine dubio eadem quæ proprii (Anacr. fragm. 27, and Fischer's note).

2. In the Plural :

- a. The Accusative in *εῖς* (instead of *έας*) from Nom. Sing. in *εως*, e.g. *γονεῖς*, Matt. x. 21 ; Lukè ii. 27 ; *γραμματεῖς*, Matt. xxiii. 34, etc. So also in Attic writers ; e.g. Xen. (see Poppo, Cyrop. p. 32 sq. ; Weber, Dem. p. 492 and 513), though the Atticists reject it ; see Mtth. I. 235.
- 61 b. The Dative of the Numeral *δυσίν* (Thom. M. 253), Matt. 6th ed. xxii. 40 ; Luke xvi. 13 ; Acts xii. 6, follows wholly the analogy of the 3d Decl. It occurs also in Thuc. 8, 101 (*δυσὶν ἡμέραις*), in Plutarch, Aristotle, Hippocrates, and others, instead of the usual *δυοῖν* ; see Lob. 210 sq. ; Bttm. I. 276. In the Genitive, *δύο* is always indeclinable ; Matt. xx. 24 ; xxi. 31 ; Jno. i. 41 ; 1 Tim. v. 19, etc., as sometimes in Greek authors, e.g. Lucian. dial. mort. 4, 1 ; Aesop. 145, 1. (Mtth. I. 337).
- c. As uncontracted forms appear — contrary to the general usage — *ὀρέων* Rev. vi. 15 (Ezek. xi. 10 ; 1 Kings xx. 28 ; Isa. xiii. 4, etc.), and *χειλέων* Heb. xiii. 15 (Prov. xii. 14 ; xxxi. 31 ; Wisd. i. 6 ; Ecclus. xxii. 27, etc.), the other cases being declined regularly. Such genitives, however, are not unfrequent even in Greek prose ; cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 145 ; Poppo, Xen. C. p. 213 ;

Jacobs, Achill. Tat. 2, 1. As to the poets, see Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. pp. x. xii.

d. The contraction of the Neut. *ἡμίση* Luke xix. 8 (as a substantive, cf. Theophr. ch. 11), to which applies what we have said above of *ἡμίσιους*. The usual form is *ἡμίσεια* (which is the reading here in some Codd.; Tdf., however, has *ἡμίσεια* from B L [Sin.], cf. Bttm. I. 248); cf. Fischer, prol. p. 667; Bttm. I. 191.

e. The contracted Gen. *πηχῶν* Jno. xxi. 8; Rev. xxi. 17, instead of *πηχέων* (as the Cod. Al. has in the first passage [and Cod. Sin. in the last]). *Πηχῶν* is a later form (see Lob. p. 246), yet it occurs in Xen. An. 4, 7, 16, and frequently in Plutarch.

From *κλείς* we have the more common form *κλείδα* Luke xi. 52 and in a few Codd. Rev. iii. 7; xx. 1 (frequently in Sept. Judg. iii. 25; Isa. xxii. 22) for (the Attic) *κλείν* (Thom. M. p. 536; Lob. 460). Yet in the Plur. *κλείδας*, Matt. xvi. 19, has more authority than *κλείς*, which, on the other hand, in Rev. i. 18 is the best attested reading. Just so *ἔριδες* 1 Cor. i. 11 and *ἐρεῖς* (as Nom. and Acc.) 2 Cor. xii. 20, occur; in Gal. v. 20, however, the correct reading is probably *ἐρεῖς*. *Κρέας* has the regular Plur. contraction (Bttm. I. 196), *κρέα*, Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. viii. 13 (Exod. xvi. 8, 12), as in Xen. C. 1, 3, 6; 2, 2, 2. On the other hand, *κέρας* has *κέρατα* Rev. v. 6; xiii. 1, 11; xvii. 12 (Amos iii. 14), *κεράτων* Rev. ix. 13; xiii. 1 (1 Kings i. 50; ii. 29), and never the contracted *κέρα*, *κερῶν* (Bttm. I. as above; Bekker, Anecd. III. p. 1001). Lastly, *τέρας* has always *τέρατα* Matt. xxiv. 24; Acts ii. 43; v. 12; Jno. iv. 48; *τεράτων*, Rom. xv. 19, instead of *τέρα*, *τερῶν*, the forms which pass for Attic; see Moeris, p. 339; Bttm. as above.

Note 1. In 1 Thess. v. 3 (Isa. xxxvii. 3) we find *ὠδίν* for *ὠδής*, Nom. Sing. of *ὠδίνες*, like *δελφίν* in later writers not unfrequent, see Bttm. I. 162 (cf. also *κλειδίν* Const. Porph. 14, 208).

Note 2. In several passages in good MSS. *πλούτος*, contrary to general usage, is used as Neuter, Eph. ii. 7; iii. 8; 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. ii. 2 (Acta apocr. p. 76), a peculiarity probably originating in the language of the people, as the modern Greeks use indiscriminately both *τὸ πλούτος* and *ὁ πλούτος*, see Coray, Plutarch. vit. II. p. 58; Isocr. II. 103, 106. In the same way we find *τὸ ἕγλος* 2 Cor. ix. 2 in Codd. B [and Sin.]; Phil. iii. 6 in A B [Sin.] (Clem. ep. p. 17 Ittig.) and perhaps *τὸ ἥχος* Luke xxi. 25, (if the Gen. be accented *ἥχους*, as it is by Lchm.), according to good Codd., as Malal. p. 121, 436. Compare in later writers, *τὸ κλάδος* Theophan. contin. ed. Bekker, p. 222; see, in general, Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 106. On the other hand, we find in later writers *ὁ δειπνός* Luke xiv. 16 B D; see Hase, ad Leon. Diac. p. 239; Schäf. ind. Aesop. pp. 128, 163; Boisson. Herod. Epim. p. 22, and Anecd. I. 51; and *ὁ τείχος* Ducas p. 266 Bonn.; Acta apocr. p. 84. The heteroclite *σκότος* (Poppo, Thuc. I. 225)

is found only once as Masc. (Heb. xii. 18 *σκότῃ*, but not certain), else always Neut. (*σκότους*, *σκότει*) without a single var. noted. As to *θεός*, which the Sept. sometimes use as Masc. (so too Philo I. 284), in N. T. MSS. the Neut. predominates (var. only Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7; xxiii. 23; Tit. iii. 5; Heb. iv. 16). *θάμβος* has, Acts iii. 10, Gen. *θάμβον* in C.

Note 3. The MSS. have several instances of *ν* subjoined to the Acc. Sing. in *α* or *ῆ* (*ἐλπιδαν*, *συγγενῆν*, cf. Sturz, dial. alex. p. 127; Lob. paralip. p. 142), as Matt. ii. 10 *ἀστέραν*, Codd. [Sin^g and] Ephr. Jno. xx. 25, *χεῖραν* Cod. Alex., and in same Cod. Rev. xii. 13 *ἄρσεναν*, xiii. 14 *εἰκόναν*, xxii. 2 *μήναν*, Acts xiv. 12 *Δίαν* according to several Codd., and Rom. xvi. 11 *συγγενῆν*, Heb. vi. 19 *ἀσφαλῆν* (this also in Codd. Ephr. and Cantab.); Rev. i. 13 *ποδῆρην*. Likewise in the Byzantine writers we find similar forms (see Index to Leo Grammat. p. 532; Boisson. anecd. V. 102), as also in the Apocr. (Tdf. de evang. apocr. p. 137), and in Rev. Lchm. has received into the text the forms quoted above. This subjoined *ν* is probably not to be considered, with Ross, as an *original* termination (transmitted in the popular speech), but as an arbitrary extension of the *ν* usual in the Acc. of many sorts of words (Mtth. 208), Lob. paralip. as above. In adjectives of two terminations in *ης*, this form is said to be Aeolic, Mtth. 289. Moreover, see also Bornem. on Acts as above.

79 § 10. FOREIGN WORDS AND WORDS WHICH ARE INDECLINABLE.

1. In the case of certain Hellenized Oriental names the Sept. and the N. T. writers have introduced a simple mode of inflection, according to which the Gen., Dat., and Voc. coincide for the most part in one and the same form, and the Acc. is designated by *ν*. To this class of nouns belong the following: *Ἰησοῦς*, Gen. *Ἰησοῦ* Matt. xxvi. 69, Dat. *Ἰησοῦ* Matt. xxvi. 17,¹ Voc. *Ἰησοῦ* Mark i. 24, Acc. *Ἰησοῦν* Matt. xxvi. 4; Acts xx. 21. *Δεῦτ* or *Δευτῆς* (Luke v. 29), Acc. *Δεῦτν* Mark ii. 14. *Ἰωσῆς* Gen. *Ἰωσῆ* Matt. xxvii. 56; Luke iii. 29, etc. (but B D and L have everywhere in Mark *Ἰωσῆτος*), Bttm. I. 199. Like *Ἰησοῦς* is declined the Egyptian name *Θαμοῦς* (Plat. Phaed. 274 d.) Mtth. I. 198. The word *Μωσῆς* (*Μωϋσῆς*) is declined in two ways. The Gen. (also in the Greek Fathers and Byzant. authors) is invariably *Μωσέως* (cf. Diod. S. Ecl. 34, p. 194, Lips.). As to the Dat., however, even good Codd. vary between *Μωσεῖ* (also in Euseb. and Theophan.) and *Μωσῆ*, cf. Matt. xvii. 4; Mark ix. 5; Luke ix. 33; Jno. v. 46; ix. 29; Acts vii. 44; Rom. ix. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 8. The Acc. is

¹ Along with these forms, the Codd. of the Sept. often have for the Dat. (Deut. iii. 21, 28; xxxi. 23) and even for the Gen. (Exod. xvii. 14) the form *Ἰησοῖ*.

Μωσῆν, Acts vi. 11; vii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 2; Heb. iii. 3 (Diod. S. 1, 94); only Luke xvi. 29 has without var. *Μωσέα* (as Euseb. H. E. 1, 3, and often in Clem. Alex., Geo. Syncell., Glycas, etc.). All these forms, with the exception of *Μωσέως*, may be derived unhesitatingly from Nom. *Μωσῆς* (see the analogies Bttm. I. 198, 210, 221). For *Μωσέως*, a Nom. *Μωσεύς* has been demanded; but it does not occur, and after all it is not necessary, since *Ἄρης* also has sometimes Gen. *Ἄρεως* (Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 224). Outside of the N. T. the Gen. *Μωσῆ* is also found in LXX. and Geo. Phrantz., and *Μωσοῦ* in Bauer, glossar. Theodoret. p. 269. *Μωσῆ* occurs as Voc. in Exod. iii. 4. *Μανασσῆ* in Matt. i. 10 has Acc. *Μανασσῆ*, according to others *Μανασσῆν*.

The name of Solomon in text. rec. is declined *Σολομῶντα* Matt. i. 6, *Σολομῶντος* Matt. xii. 42; Luke xi. 31; Jno. x. 23; Acts iii. 11; v. 12 (like *Ξενοφῶν*, *Ξενοφῶντος*). But the better MSS. have *Σολομῶνος*, *Σολομῶνα*, see Wetsten. I. 228; and this, being according to analogy and also the received form in Joseph. ed. Havercamp, deserves probably to be admitted into the text, since the termination *ῶν*, *ῶντος* implies derivation from a participle (Bttm. I. 169; Lob. paralip. 347). But then we must write in the Nom. (not *Σολομῶν*, as Lchm. even has printed, but) *Σολομών* 80 agreeably to the better authorities,¹ like *Βαβυλῶν*, etc. (cf. also Pappelb. Cod. Diez. p. 9). *Ποσειδῶν* (*Ποσειδῶνος*), being contracted from *Ποσειδάων*, is not analogous. In the Sept. *Σολομών* is indeclinable; see 1 Kings iv. 7, 29; v. 12, 15, 16; vi. 18, and elsewhere.

2. Many Hebrew proper names which might have been inflected according to the 3d Decl. are used in the Sept. and in the N. T. as indeclinable; e.g. *Ἀαρών* Gen., Heb. vii. 11; ix. 4; Dat., Exod. 66 vii. 9; Acts vii. 40; Acc., Exod. vii. 8; cf. in particular Matt. i. 7th ed. and Luke iii. 23 sqq.; besides *Συμεών* Luke iii. 30, *Σαλμών* Luke iii. 32, *Κεδρών* Jno. xviii. 1 var. So *Ἰεριχῶ*, Gen. Deut. xxxii. 49; Matt. xx. 29; Heb. xi. 30; Acc., Luke x. 30; xviii. 35 (Glyc. p. 304).² *Ἱερουσαλήμ*, for which, however, in Matt. Mark and Jno. the Grecized form *Ἱεροσόλυμα* might on the authority of MSS. be preferred, which is regularly declined as Neut., Matt. iv. 25; 64 Mark iii. 8; Luke xxiii. 7; Jno. ii. 23. It is Feminine only in 6th ed.

¹ In Glycas *Bekker* has had printed, even in the new edition, *Σολομῶντος*, *Σολομῶντα*, but for the Nom. *Σολομών*.

² Elsewhere, on the other hand, we find a twofold mode of declining the word: *a*. Gen. *Ἱεριχοῦ* 3 Esr. v. 44, Dat. *Ἱεριχῶ* Procop. de aedif. 5, 9; Theodoret. V. p. 81, Hal., or *Ἱεριχοῖ* Joseph. b. j. 1, 21, 4. Suid. under *Ἰεριγενής*; and *b*. from *Ἱερικοῦς* (Ptol. 5, 16, 7), Gen. *Ἱερικοῦντος* Strabo 16, 763, Acc. *Ἱερικοῦντα* 16, 760, and usually in Josephus.

Matt. ii. 3 (iii. 5?). The Sept. has only the form *Ἱερουσαλήμ*; Joseph., on the contrary, *Ἱεροσόλυμα*. *Τὸ πάσχα*, Luke ii. 41; Jno. ii. 23; as in Sept.¹ So also (τὸ) *σίκερα* Luke i. 15, and in Sept. Lev. x. 9; Num. vi. 3; Isa. xxiv. 9, etc. (Euseb. praep. ev. 6, 10, has Gen. *σίκερος*).² The Hebrew Plural termination occurs only in Heb. ix. 5, *Χερουβίμ*; this word, however, as in the Sept., is construed as Neut. (Gen. iii. 24; 1 Kings viii. 7; Ezek. x. 3, etc.) like *πνεύματα*.

Also in Rev. i. 4 a whole phrase (the Greek equivalent for *πᾶν*) is treated as indeclinable: *ἀπὸ ὃ ὦν καὶ ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ἐρχόμενος*, perhaps with design (as the name of the immutable One) like *ἐν*, *μηθέν*, etc. in Greek philosophical writings, even in Aristot. e.g. polit. 5, 3; Procl. theol. Plat. 2. ed. Hoeschel *μετὰ τοῦ ἐν*, *χωρὶς τοῦ ἐν* (Stollberg, de soloecis. N. T. p. 14 sqq.). On the other hand, in Creuzer's edition of the writings of Proclus we find invariably *ἐκ τοῦ ἐνός*, *ἐν τῷ ἐνί*. Cf. also *τὸν ὃ δέωνα*, Schäf. Demosth. III. 282.

81 § 11. INFLECTION AND COMPARISON OF 'ADJECTIVES.

1. Adjectives of three terminations, particularly those in *ιος*, *μιος*, *ειος*, *αιος*, are not unfrequently (especially in Attic authors) used as adjectives of only two terminations (Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. p. 77, Lips.; Monk, Eurip. Hippol. p. 56, and Eurip. Alcest. 126, 67 548, 1043; Mtth. 295 ff.). In the N. T. we find Luke ii. 13 *στρατιά* 7th ed. *οὐράνιος*, Acts xxvi. 19, *κόσμιος* 1 Tim. ii. 9; also Rev. iv. 3 *ἱρις* (Fem.) *κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου ὅμοιος* (the best established reading) *συναργδίνω*, etc.; see my exeget. Stud. I. 152. On the other hand, in 1 Tim. ii. 8 *δσίους χεῖρας* (for *δσίας*, which some Codd. in fact have), *δσίους* may possibly be construed with *ἐπαίροντας*, though that is not necessary (Fr. Rom. III. 16). Cf. also Tit. iii. 9 *μάταιοι* referring to a Fem. subst., and Jas. i. 26 *μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία*.

On the other hand, later Greek has used adjectives of two terminations as adjectives of three terminations; as, *ἀργός* Lob. p. 105,

¹ So also in the Fathers; see Suicer, thes. II. 607 sqq.; Epiphan. haer. II. 19 gives inflection even to the Plur. *τὰ πάσχα*.

² Most of these names are declined in Josephus, who generally, in conformity to the genius of the Greek language, gives terminations to almost all proper names (of persons), and consequently declines them; e.g. *Ἀδάμιος*, *Ἰσμαῆλος*, *Νῶχος*, *Ἰσακος*, and others. The instances of undeclined foreign names, which Georgi, Hierocr. I. 138, produces from Plato and Pausan., are partly not to the point, and partly prove nothing against the tendency to inflection. Even Ptolem., besides the large number of declined names of places, used some as indeclinable; Nobbe, schedae Ptolem. I. (Lips. 1841. 8vo.) p. 23 sq.

and paralip. p. 455 sqq., cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 242. Yet this occurs in a quotation from Epimenides Tit. i. 12. Συγγενής, ἐς, forms a special feminine συγγενίς (substant.) Luke i. 36, which on the authority of good Codd. Lchm. has adopted, Lob. Phryn. 451 sq. Cf. Malal. pp. 95, 96.

Αἰώνιος has in the N. T. usually but two terminations; but in 2 Thess. 65 ii. 16; Heb. ix. 12 αἰωνίαν occurs in the text, and in the latter passage ^{6th ed} without var.; also, according to some Codd., in 2 Pet. i. 11; Acts xiii. 48; cf. Num. xxv. 13, Plat. Tim. 38 b. Βεβαία Rom. iv. 16, etc., which the fastidious Thom. M. 149 declares to be corrupt, is found in Isocr., Demosth. (Weber, Dem. p. 133), Xenoph., etc., cf. Duker, Thuc. 2, 43. Ἐρημος, which even in Attic varies (cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 262; Mth. 306), in the N. T. always has two terminations. As to ἀσφαλὴν Heb. vi. 19, i.e. ἀσφαλῆν [so too Lchm. in his stereotype ed., while in his larger ed. he writes ἀσφαλῆν] see § 9. note 3, p. 66.

The N. T. Lexicons [Grimm, however, has it correctly] give γήσιος as an adjective of two terminations (Phil. iv. 3?) without sufficient reason, since the Fem. in the form γήσιος cannot be shown to occur.

2. On the Comparison of adjectives we have only to observe,

a. The Compar. Neut. of ταχύς is τάχιον (Jno. xx. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 14; Heb. xiii. 19, 23, etc.), for which in earlier Greek θᾶσσον, and in Attic θᾶπτον, was usual. Τάχιον occurs regularly in Diod. S., Dion. H., Plutarch and others, Lob. p. 77; Meineke, Menandr. p. 144; cf. also 1 Macc. ii. 40; Wisd. xiii. 9.

b. In 3 Jno. 4 we find a double Comparative μειζότερος, and in Eph. iii. 8 a Compar. formed from the Superlative ελαχιστότερος ⁸² (cf. ελαχιστότατος Sext. Emp. 9, 406, and in Latin, *minimissimus*, *pessimissimus*). Such forms belong specially to the diction of poetry (Apoll. Rhod. 2, 368, μειότερος), or to the later language which sought thus to strengthen the Comparative that had become weak to the popular mind; cf. κρειττότερος Ducas 27, 29, 37, μειζονότερος ibid. c. 27, and Malal. 18, p. 490, μειζότερος Constant. Porph. III. 257, πλειότερος Theophan. p. 567. Yet some such instances are found even in earlier authors (see Wetst. II. 247), though, as in the case of ἐσχατώτερος Aristot. Metaph. 10, 4, not ⁶⁸ as already existing and current, but as arbitrary formations; see ^{7th ed} Bttm. I. 274 f., Lob. Phryn. p. 136. In German compare the form *mehrere* from *mehr*.

c. The Comparatives κατώτερος Eph. iv. 9, ἀνώτερος Luke xiv. 10, ἐσώτερος Acts xvi. 24, from the adverbs κάτω, ἄνω, ἔσω, are groundlessly questioned by Bttm. I. 271. They are the undoubted read-

ings in the N. T. and Sept., and not only occur frequently in later authors, as Leo Diac. 10, 1, but even in Attic, Mtth. 328.

On the form of the Comp. of other Adverbs derived from Adjectives, as *περισσotέρως* 2 Cor. i. 12; Gal. i. 14; Phil. ii. 28, etc., which is not unknown to classic Greek writers, see Bttm. II. 345; Elmsley, Eurip. Herac. p. 100 Lips.

The Positive *ἥρεμος* 1 Tim. ii. 2 is not found in earlier Greek (Bttm. I. 271, II. 343); Lob. pathol. p. 158 has shown that it occurs in Inscript. Olbiopol. 2059, 24.

§ 12. AUGMENT AND REDUPLICATION OF REGULAR VERBS.

1. A temporal Augment instead of the syllabic occurs,

a. In the Imperfect *ἤμελλε* Jno. iv. 47; xi. 51; xii. 33; xviii. 32; Luke x. 1; Acts xvi. 27; xxvii. 33; Rev. x. 4, with decided preponderance of authority. On the contrary, *ἐμελλε* in Luke 66 ix. 31; Jno. vi. 71; Heb. xi. 8, is better attested. See in general 6th ed Böckh, Plat. Men. p. 148 sq.

b. In the Imperfect *ἡδύνato* Matt. xxvi. 9; Mark vi. 5, 19; xiv. 5; Jno. ix. 33; xi. 37; Luke viii. 19; xix. 3, with preponderance of authority; there is good evidence on the other hand for *ἐδύνato* Luke i. 22; Acts xxvi. 32, and Rev. xiv. 3, and *ἐδύνασθε* 1 Cor. 83 iii. 2. The Aorist *ἡδυνήθη* is fully established in Matt. xvii. 16, 19; Mark ix. 28; Luke ix. 40; 1 Cor. iii. 1. See on these current Attic forms Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 32; Bttm. I. 317; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 554; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. p. 208; Boisson. Aen. Gaz. p. 173, and Anecd. V. p. 19; cf. Bornem. Act. p. 278.

c. But neither *ἡβουλόμην* Acts xv. 37; xxviii. 18 nor *ἡβουλήθη* 2 Jno. 12 (Mtth. 375) is sufficiently attested; see Bornem. Act. 233.

2. The syllabic Augment in a verb beginning with a vowel occurs, Jno. xix. 32 f. *κατέαξαν* 1st Aor. from *κατάγνυμι* (cf. Thom. M. 498), and even in the other Moods, as *καταγαῶσι* Jno. xix. 31, Bttm. II. 97; cf. Thuc. 3, 89; Aristot. anim. 9, 43; Plat. Cratyl. 389 b. and c.¹ Also Fut. *κατεάξω* Matt. xii. 20 and Sept., to distinguish it from the Fut. of the verb *κατάγω*. On the other hand, instead of *ἑωνησάμην*, in which verb the syllabic Augment is most usual in Greek authors, we find Acts vii. 16 *ὠνησάμην*, as sometimes in classic Greek (Lob. 139); and for *ἔωσα*, *ἑωσάμην* Acts

¹ In Cinnam. p. 190, we find besides an unusual form of the Perfect, *κατεδάγηκε*.

vii. 27, 39, 45, ὤσα, ὠσάμην, see § 15. Cf. similar instances in Poppo, Thuc. III. II. p. 407; Index to Leo Gramm. p. 533.

3. In verbs beginning with *ευ* we find

a. Unaugmented εὐδόκησα preponderating, only in Matt. xvii. 5; 69 1 Cor. x. 5; Col. i. 19; Heb. x. 6, 8 is ἡνδόκησα favored by the 7th ed. Codd. Also εὐλόγησα predominant over ἡνλόγησα (Matt. xiv. 19; Luke xxiv. 30; Heb. xi. 20, 21). Likewise Perf. εὐλόγηκεν Heb. vii. 6; εὐχοντο Acts xxvii. 29, εὐχαρίστησε Acts xxvii. 35, εὐπορεῖτο Acts xi. 29; εὕρισκεν decidedly (only Mark xiv. 55 is ἡύρισκον supported by good Codd.; further, cf. Acts vii. 46; Luke xix. 48), cf. Lob. p. 140, and Soph. Ai. p. 123; Hm. Eurip. Bacch. p. 11; Boisson. Philostr. epp. p. 75. Even in Attic the Augm. is defended by Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 191, and it occurs frequently in the Apocr. (Evang. Nicod. c. 20) and the Fathers.

b. With Augm. ἡνχόμην preponderating Rom. ix. 3 (without Augm. see Xen. Anab. 4, 8, 25; Cyrop. 3, 2, 15, yet not without var.), ἡνχαρίστησαν Rom. i. 21, ἡνφόρησεν Luke xii. 16 (doubtful), ἡνκαίρουν Mark vi. 31 (on the other hand Acts xvii. 21 doubtful), ἡνφράνθη Acts ii. 26 (from Sept.). Cf. generally Bttm. I. 321; Poppo, Thuc. I. 227, also Lehm. Lucian II. p. 456. Εὐαγγελίζ. has the Augm. after *ευ*, and that without var. Acts viii. 35, 40; xvii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 1; Gal. iv. 13; Rev. x. 7, etc. (see Lob. p. 269), even προεηγγελίσατο Gal. iii. 8. So also εὐαρεστεῖν Heb. xi. 5 (yet Cod. A and several others, without Augm.). Of *προς* 84 εὔχεσθαι the forms nearly always have Augm. without var., as προσηύξατο Matt. xxvi. 44, προσηύχετο Mark i. 35; Acts viii. 15; Luke xxii. 41, etc.

4. The only verb beginning with *οι* which occurs in past tenses, οἰκοδομεῖν, has, not indeed without var., but on vastly preponderating authority, the regular Augment; as, ὤκοδόμησε Matt. vii. 24; 67 xxi. 33, ὤκοδόμητο Luke iv. 29, ὤκοδόμουν Luke xvii. 28, ὤκοδομήθη 6th ed. Jno. ii. 20. Only in Acts vii. 47, good Codd. have οἰκοδόμησε, on which later form see Lob. 153.

5. Προφητεύειν has in Jude 14 with preponderating authority the Augment after the preposition, as usual (Bttm. I. 335); but the better Codd. give elsewhere forms like ἐπροφήτευσαν Matt. xi. 13, ἐπροφητεύσαμεν Matt. vii. 22, ἐπροφήτευσεν Matt. xv. 7; Mark vii. 6; Luke i. 67; Jno. xi. 51, ἐπροφήτεον Acts xix. 6. Schulz ad Matt. vii. 22, advised that the latter should be everywhere received into the text, and this Lehm. and Tdf. have done. In later writers the Augment is often put before the preposition; as,

ἐπρόσθηκεν, ἐσυμβούλευον (see Index to Ducas, to Jo. Cananus and others, in the Bonn ed.), ἐκατήχουν Epiphan. Mon. 33, 16.¹ In προφητεύειν, however, this is less surprising, as there was no simple φητεύειν; cf. Num. xi. 25 f; Sir. xlviii. 13.

6. The Augment of the form εἶληφα (for the unusual λέληφα, Bttm. I. 316), is transferred also to the 1st. Aor., κατελήφθη for κατελήφθη Jno. viii. 4, not without var. (see Maittaire, dialectt. ed. Sturz, p. 58); traces of this already existed in Ionism.

7. A double Augment occurs,

a. In ἀπεκατεστάθη Matt. xii. 13; Mark iii. 5; Luke vi. 10, now properly in the text (cf. Lucian, Philopat. c. 27 ἀπεκατέστησε, 70th ed. Ducas 29 ἀπεκατέστησαν, Theophan. p. 374 ἀπεκατέστη, Cinnam. p. 259 ἀντεκατέστην; see Dindorf, Diod. S. p. 539, and Schäf. Plutarch. V. p. 198).²

b. In ἀνέφρξεν Jno. ix. 14, 30, ἀνεφύχθη Luke i. 64 (Bttm. II. 250), once even in Aor. Inf. ἀνεφύχθηναι Luke iii. 21. Good Codd. give, further, many other forms in this verb, viz. ἤνοιξεν Rev. xii. 16 etc., ἠνοίχθησαν Rev. xx. 12, ἠνοίγην Acts xii. 10; Rev. xi. 19; xv. 5, as in Sept. and later writers (Bttm. as above 251; Lob. p. 153), and with a threefold augment, Matt. ix. 30 ἠνεφύχθησαν; Jno. ix. 10; Acts xvi. 26; Acts ix. 8; Rev. xix. 11 ἠνεφργμένοι (Nicet. Eugen. 2, 84, 128, var.); var. Jno. ix. 14; Rev. xx. 12 (Gen. vii. 11; viii. 6; Dan. vii. 10; 3 Macc. vi. 18). Cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 669.

85 c. In ἠνείχεσθε 2 Cor. xi. 1, 4, text. rec. (cf. Thuc. 5, 45, Herodi. 8, 5, 9) and ἠνεσχόμην, for ἀνεσχ. Acts xviii. 14 (cf. Her. 7, 159; Thuc. 3, 28) exactly as in Greek writers, who in these forms hardly admit the single Augm. (Bttm. II. 189); yet in 2 Cor. the better Codd. have ἀνείχεσθε.

8. Ἐργάζομαι has, according to Codd., several times ἠργάσατο for εἰργάσατο Matt. xxv. 16; xxvi. 10; Mark xiv. 6; Luke xix. 16; Acts xviii. 3 (Exod. xxxvi. 4). The same form occurs also in a good MS. of Demosth. (Schäf. appar. V. p. 553); cf. Sturz, p. 125. On the other hand, good Codd. (Lehm. and Tdf.) have from ἐλκοῦν in Luke xvi. 20, εἰλκαμένος; cf. also Clem. Al. p. 348 Syllb.

9. The Augm. is for the most part entirely omitted in the forms of the Pluperf.; as, Mark xiv. 44 δεδώκει (xv. 10; Jno. xi. 57),

¹ Epiphanii Mon. edita et inedita cura A. Dressel. Paris, 1843. 8vo.

² Compare also ἐπροεφήτεον Leo Gramm. pp. 33, 35, and 36, ἐκατεσκεύασαν Canan. 462, ἐσυνεμαρτύρουν ibid. 478, ἠφώρισται Theophan. 112, ἐπροέταξα Theodor. Gramm. 40, 8. As to the Attic Authors, see V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 55.

Mark xv. 7 πεποιήκεισαν (xvi. 9 ἐκβεβλήκει), Luke vi. 48 [var.; 68 Matt. vii. 25] τεθεμελίωτο, 1 Jno. ii. 19 μεμενήκεισαν, Acts xiv. 8th ed. περιπεπατήκει (see Valcken. on the passage), vs. 23 πεπιστεύκεισαν. In consistency, these forms are to be preferred in the N. T. text. Ionic prose authors also (Her. 1, 122. 3, 42. 9, 22) and Attic (e.g. Plato) drop the Augm. in the Pluperf. often, especially in forms that would offend the ear (Bttm. I. 318), particularly in compounds (cf. Acts xiv. 8); (see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 179; Poppo, Thuc. I. p. 228; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 272; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 68; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. pp. 265, 284); cf. Thuc. 8, 92; Xen. O. 3, 2, 24. As to the later writers see especially the Index to Joa. Cinnam. Bonn ed.

10. The reduplication after the analogy of μέμνημαι (Bttm. I. 315) appears in μνηστεύεσθαι Luke i. 27; ii. 5 μεμνηστευμένη, not, however, without the opposition of good Codd. Cf. Sept. Deut. xx. 7; xxii. 23.sqq. On ῥεραντισμένοι Heb. x. 22, see § 13, 1. b.

In the best Codd. the Aor. of the compound ἐπαισχύνομαι 2 Tim. i. 16, is formed without the temp. Aug. ἐπαισχύνθη, and recent editors have admitted it into the text. So also Luke xiii. 18, ἀνορθώθη.

§ 13. RARE FORMS IN THE TENSES AND PERSONS OF REGULAR VERBS.

1. a. Tenses which in other respects follow completely the 71 analogy of the 2d Aor., have in the Sept. the termination *a* and 7th ed. so forth (of the 1st Aor.) (see Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 61; Valckenaer, Herod. p. 649, 91; Dorville, Charit. p. 402; Wolf, Demosth. Lept. 86 p. 216), e.g. εἶδαμεν 1 Sam. x. 14, εἶδαν and ἔφυγαν 2 Sam. x. 14, εὔραν xvii. 20, ἐφάγαμεν xix. 42, ἐλθάτω Esth. v. 4 (Prov. ix. 5; Amos vi. 2; 2 Chron. xxix. 17), etc. In the N. T. modern editors have restored this form, agreeably to the concurrent testimony of the best Codd.¹: Matt. xxv. 36 ἦλθατε, ἐξήλθατε, Matt. xxvi. 39 παρελθάτω, 2 Thess. ii. 13 εἴλατο, Acts vii. 10; xii. 11 ἐξείλατο, vii. 21 ἀνείλατο, Gal. v. 4 ἐξέπέσατε, Rev. vii. 11 (Heb. iii. 17; Jno. xviii. 6) ἔπασαν, Jno. vi. 10 ἀνέπασαν, Heb. ix. 12 εὐράμενος, (Epiph. Opp. I. 619; Theodoret, Opp. II. 837, Hal.) cf. Acts ii. 23; xvii. 6; xii. 7; xvi. 37; xxii. 7; xxviii. 16; Matt. vii. 13, 25; xi. 7 f.;

¹ Respecting the MSS. which have this form, see Hug, Einleit. I. S. 238, 242, 244, 247, 249, 263; Scholz, curae crit. p. 40; Rinck, lucubratt. p. 37; Tdf. prolegg. ad Cod. Ephraemi, p. 21.

- xvii. 6; xxii. 22; xxv. 36; xxvi. 39, 55; Luke ii. 16; xi. 52; xxii. 52; Rom. xv. 3; 1 Cor. x. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 17; 1 Jno. ii. 19; Rev. v. 8, 14; vi. 13. In the Codd. we find, to be sure, no sort of consistency in respect either to the writers or to the words.¹
- 69 In many passages where this form appears in only a few Codd. it
 6th ed. might be attributed to the transcribers,² particularly where similar flexions in *a* precede or follow; see Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 232 Lips.; Fr. Mr. 638 sqq. Further, it is found mainly in the 1st Per. Sing. and Plur. or 2d or 3d Per. Plur. In the 2d Sing., on the other hand, the Imperative and the Partic., it very seldom occurs. On instances of such Aor. in Greek authors (e.g. Orpheus) see Bttm. I. 404. *Προσέπεσα* occurring in Eurip. Troad. 293 Seidler has changed into *προσέπεσαν*; and in Alcest. 477 undoubtedly *πέσοι* should be read for *πέσειε*, see Herm. on the passage.³ On the other hand, we find in Theophan. p. 283 *ἔπεσαν*, Achill. Tat. 3, 17 *κατεπέσαμεν*, c. 19 *περιεπέσαμεν*, and Eustath. amor. Ism. I. p. 4. should, on the authority of good Codd., be amended *ἐκπέσειε*, see Jacobs p. 664; cf. besides Lob. 183; Mtth. I. 424 f. In the
- 72 Byzantine writers various forms of this sort unquestionably occur,
 7th ed. e.g. *ἦλθαν* Malalas 18, p. 465; 12, p. 395, *ἀνῆλθαν* 15, p. 389, *ἤυραμεν* 18, p. 449, *ἀπέλθατε* Ducas 24, *ἐξέλθατε* Leo Gr. p. 343, *ἐπεισέλθατε* 87 *ibid.* p. 337. Cf. in general the Index to Ducas, p. 639, and to Theophan. p. 682 sq. Bonn.

b. The past tenses of verbs beginning with *ρ* are found in the best Codd. with a single *ρ* (cf. § 5 No. 4); as, 2 Cor. xi. 25 *ἐραβδίσθην*, Heb. ix. 19 *ἐράντισε* (x. 22 *ἐραντισμένοι*), Matt. xxvi. 67 *ἐράπισαν*, according to AD 2 Tim. iii. 11 *ἐρύσατο*, according to AC [Sin.] iv. 17 *ἐρύσθην*; cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 18; Exod. v. 23; vii. 10; Lev. xiv. 7, 51; Num. viii. 7. Such forms are confessedly poetic, Bttm. I. 84; Mtth. I. 124, yet they frequently occur also in the Codd. of Greek prose, Bast, comment. crit. p. 788. In the Perf. the Codd.

¹ They are mostly verbs whose 1st Aor. is not in use.

² *Ἀνάπεσαι*, which, according to good Codd., occurs in Luke xiv. 10; xvii. 7 (a trace of it appears in Polyb. 6, 37, 4, *ἐκπεσάμεναι* var.), must be the Imperat. of a similarly formed Aor. Mid. (*ἀνεπεσάμην*). As, however, the latter nowhere occurs, *ἀνάπεσαι* is probably to be regarded as a mistake of the copyist (copyists often interchanged *ε* and *αι*) for *ἀνάπεσε*, which, in fact, is the reading of the best Codd., and has been recently received into the text; cf. also Rinck, lucubratt. p. 330. Besides, it is only the 2d Aor. Act. of this verb that is found, Matt. xv. 35; Mark vi. 40; Luke xi. 37; xxii. 14; Jno. vi. 10, etc. The Fut. (as *πείσας*), for which Fr. Mr. p. 641 is disposed to take these forms, does not accord well with the construction, particularly as in the second passage Imperatives immediately follow.

³ On the other hand, a Greek inscription in Bockh, II. 220 has, distinctly, *εἵπειαν*.

Al. [Sin.] and Ephraem. Heb. x. 22, give the reduplicated form *ῥεραντισμένοι*, of which, besides the Homeric (*Odys.* 6, 59) *ῥερωμένα*, several examples occur in later writers, *Lob. paralip.* 13. So in *Matt.* ix. 36 the *Cod. Cantab.* gives *ῥεριμμένοι*, which *Lchm.* has adopted.

c. The Futures of verbs in *ίζω* sometimes are found (with unimportant var. in *Codd.*) in the contracted form; as, *μετοικιῶ* *Acts* vii. 43, *ἀφοριεῖ* *Matt.* xxv. 32, *ἀφοριῶσι* *Matt.* xiii. 49, *γνωριῶσι* *Col.* iv. 9, *καθαριεῖ* *Heb.* ix. 14, *διακαθαριεῖ* *Matt.* iii. 12, *ἐλπιῶσι* *Matt.* xii. 21, *μακαριῶσι* *Luke* i. 48, etc. This is an Atticism (though the same form was not foreign to the Ionians also); cf. *Georgi*, *Hieroc.* I. p. 29; *Fischer*, *Weller.* II. p. 355; *Mtth.* I. p. 402. Of *βαπτίζω* the common form *βαπτίσει* alone is used *Matt.* iii. 11. On *στηρίζω* see § 15. In the Sept. verbs in *αζω* also are inflected after the same analogy in the Future, e.g. *ἐργάται* *Lev.* xxv. 40, *ἀρπᾶ* *xix.* 13, etc. Such Attic Futures of contract verbs ⁷⁰ some have wished to find in *Matt.* ii. 4 *γενῶνται*, *Jno.* xvi. 17 *θεωρεῖτε* ⁷¹ (on account of *ὄψεσθε* following), *Matt.* xxvi. 18 *ποιῶ*; but all these are Presents. See § 41, 2; cf. *Fr. Mt.* as above, *Mtth.* p. 403f.

d. Of verbs in *αίνω*, *λευκαίνω* has in the Aor. the Attic form (*Bttm.* I. 439) *λευκᾶναι* *Mark* ix. 3, and *βασκαίνω* *Gal.* iii. 1 in var. has the equally classic form *ἐβάσκηνα*. But *σημαίνω* has Aor. *ἐσήμανα* *Acts* xi. 28; *Rev.* i. 1, see below, § 15. *Μωραίνω* *1 Cor.* i. 20 and *ξηραίνω* *Jas.* i. 11, have the *α* as verbs in *ραίνω* do regularly. Respecting *φᾶναι* see § 15, p. 89.

e. Futures Subjunctive are occasionally noted in individual passages, from a greater or less number of *Codd.*, e.g. *1 Cor.* xiii. 3 *καυθήσωμαι* (adopted by *Griesbach*), *1 Pet.* iii. 1 *κερδηθήσονται*, *1 Tim.* vi. 8 *ἀρκεσθισώμεθα* (in both passages without much authority). In the better class of authors such forms probably originate with the transcribers, see *Abresch* in *Observatt.* misc. III. p. 13; *Lob.* 721; but in later writers, and the Scholiasts particularly (cf. *Thuc.* 3, 11 and 54), they cannot be rejected (see *Niebuhr*, ind. ad *Agath.* p. 418, and ind. to *Theophan.* p. 682). In the N. T., however, there is very little authority for these Subjunctives. ⁷³ Quite isolated are *εἰρήσης* *Rev.* xviii. 14 and *εἰρήσωσιν* *Rev.* ix. 6 ⁷⁴ (yet an Aor. *εἰρήσαι* also occurs, see *Lob.* p. 721), *γνώσονται* *Acts* 88 xxi. 24 (yet cf. *Lob.* p. 735). (*ὄψησθε* *Luke* xiii. 28 and *δώσῃ* *Jno.* xvii. 2, are unquestionably Aor.)

2. Peculiar personal endings are:

a. The 2d Per. Sing. Pres. and Fut. Pass. and Mid. in *ει* for *η*;

as, *βούλει* Luke xxii. 42, *παρέξει* vii. 4 (var.), *ὄφει* Matt. xxvii. 4 and Jno. xi. 40 (var.). Cf. also Matt. xxvii. 4; Acts xvi. 31; xxiv. 8 (var.). In the two verbs *ἔπτεσθαι* and *βούλεσθαι* this is the form invariably used in Attic (Bttm. I. 348); in other verbs it seldom occurs, and almost exclusively in the poets (cf. Valcken. ad Phoen. p. 216 sq.; Fischer ad Weller. I. p. 119, II. p. 399; Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 34; Schwarz ad Olear. p. 225), yet it appears in good MSS. even of Attic prose, Bttm. as above; but cf. Schneider, praef. ad Plat. civ. I. p. 49 sqq.

b. In the 2d Per. Sing. we find the original uncontracted form not only in *δύνασαι* (Matt. v. 36; viii. 2; Mark i. 40) where it continued to be the usual form, Bttm. I. 502 (yet cf. *δύνη* Mark ix. 22; Rev. ii. 2, and var. Luke xvi. 2,¹ which at first was used only by the poets, subsequently by prose authors also, e.g. Polyb. 7, 11, 5; Aelian. 13, 32, see Lob. 359), but we find it also in contract verbs, *ὀδυνᾶσαι* Luke xvi. 25 (Aeschyl. Choëph. 354), *καυχᾶσαι* Rom. ii. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 7, and *κατακαυχᾶσαι* Rom. xi. 18; cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 184; Bttm. I. 347; Boisson. Anecd. IV. p. 479. See *πίνω* below.

c. In the 3d Per. Plur. of the Perfect *αν* for *ασι* (from the old termination *αντι*); as, *ἔγνωκαν* Jno. xvii. 7, *τετῆρηκαν* xvii. 6, 7th ed. *εἶρηκαν* Rev. xix. 3, also Luke ix. 36 and Col. ii. 1 *ἑώρακαν* in very good Codd., likewise Rev. xxi. 6; Jas. v. 4. So also in Sept., e.g. Deut. xi. 7; Judith vii. 10 (Acta apocr. p. 235). This form belongs to the Alexandrian dialect; cf. Sext. Emp. 1, 10, p. 261, and the Papyri Taurin. p. 24 (*κεκυρίευκαν*); but occurs also in Lycophr. 252 (*πέφρικαν*), in inscriptions and often in the Byzantine writers (cf. Index to Ducas p. 639, to Codin. and Leo Gramm.); see Bttm. I. 345. Tdf. has received it into the text in all the above passages of the N. T. But in Rev. ii. 3 he has rejected [yet not in ed. vii.] the form *κεκοπίαντες* (Exod. v. 22) found in AC.

d. The 1st Aor. Opt. has the original Æolic termination *εια*, *ειας*, *ειε*, instead of *αιμι*; as, *ψηλαφήσειαν* Acts xvii. 27, *ποιήσειαν* Luke 89 vi. 11. So very frequently (in 2d and 3d Sing. and 3d Plur.) in Attic authors: Thuc. 6, 19. 8, 6; Aristoph. Plut. 95; Plat. rep. I. 337 c.; Gorg. 500 c.; Xen. An. 7, 7, 30, etc.; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 150 sq.; Bttm. I. 354 f., and still more frequently in later authors. See Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 353.

74 e. The 3d Per. Plur. of the Imperative in *τωσαν* occurs repeat-

7th ed.

¹ As to this form, which some would exchange for *δύνη*, compare Porson, Eurip. Hec. 257; Schäf. and Hm. Soph. Philoct. 787; Oudend. ad Thom. M. p. 252; Lob. p. 359.

edly in the N. T.; as, 1 Cor. vii. 9 *γαμησάτωσαν*, vii. 36 *γαμείτωσαν*, 1 Tim. v. 4 *μανθανέτωσαν* (Tit. iii. 14), cf. Acts xxiv. 20; xxv. 5. The assertion of Elmsley, Eurip. Iphig. T. p. 232, ed. Lips., that this form did not become usual till after Aristotle's time, has been fully refuted by Mtth. I. 442 and Bornem. Xen. An. p. 38.

f. The 3d Per. Plur. of the historical tenses has often, in good Codd., the termination *σαν* (Bttm. I. 346); as, Jno. xv. 22, 24 *εἶχσαν* for *εἶχον*, xix. 3 *ἐδίδσαν* for *ἐδίδουν*, 2 Thess. iii. 6 *παρελάβσαν*, and Rom. iii. 13 from Sept. *ἐδολιούσαν*. This termination is much used in the Sept. and by the Byzantines; as, Exod. xv. 27 *ἦλθοσαν*, Josh. v. 11 *ἐφάγσαν*, Exod. xvi. 24 *κατελίποσαν*, xviii. 26 *ἐκρίνοσαν*, Niceph. Greg. 6, 5, p. 113 *εἶδσαν*, Nicet. Chon. 21, 7, p. 402 *κατήλθοσαν*, Niceph. Bryenn. p. 165 *μετήλθοσαν*, Brunck, Analect. II. p. 47; cf. also 1 Macc. vi. 31; Cant. iii. 3; v. 7; vi. 8; Josh. ii. 1; iii. 14; v. 11; vi. 14; viii. 19; Judg. xix. 11; i. 6; Ruth i. 4; Lam. ii. 14; Ezek. xxii. 11; Exod. xxxiii. 8, etc., Fischer, Weller. II. p. 336 sq.; Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 165 sq.; Lob. Phryn. 349, and pathol. 485; Sturz, p. 58 sqq. In the N. T. however, with the exception of Rom. as above, only single Codd. give this form, and it may possibly be attributable everywhere to the Alexandrian transcribers.

3. Of contracted verbs we must note

a. The Future *ἐκχεῶ* Acts ii. 17, 18 Sept., after the manner of verbs in λ, μ, ν, ρ, cf. LXX. Ezek. vii. 8; xxi. 31; Jer. xiv. 16; Hos. v. 10; Zech. xii. 10; Bttm. I. p. 369. Were it accented *ἐκχέω*, it would be, according to Elmsley, the Attic Fut., as this form is both Pres. and Fut.; see Bttm. II. 325. But in Sept. with the same accent it is further inflected, *ἐκχεεῖς*, *ἐκχεείτε*, Exod. iv. 9; xxix. 12; xxx. 18; Deut. xii. 16.

b. The usual forms of the two verbs *διψάω*, *πεινάω*, in the (Attic) literary language were Inf. *διψῆν*, *πεινῆν*, and Indic. *διψῆς*, *διψῆ*, etc., Bttm. I. 487. In the N. T. we find instead *διψᾶν*, *διψᾷ* Rom. xii. 20; Jno. vii. 37, *πεινᾶν* Phil. iv. 12, *πεινᾷ* Rom. xii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 21, which first occurs after the time of Aristot. (Anim. 72 9, 31, cf. Sallier ad Thom. M. p. 699; Lob. 61). According to the same analogy we find Fut. *πεινάσω* (for *πεινήσω*) Rev. vii. 16; 90 Jno. vi. 35 var. (Isa. v. 27; Psalm xlix. 12), and 1st Aor. *ἐπείνασα* Mark ii. 25; xi. 12; Matt. xii. 1, 3; xxv. 35; Luke iv. 2. Both forms are peculiarities of later Greek; see Lob. 204.

c. Of verbs in *εω*, retaining *ε* in the Fut. etc. (Lob. paral. 435), we find in the N. T. *καλέσω*, *τελέσω* (Bttm. I. p. 392), also *φορέσω*

and *ἐφόρεσα* 1 Cor. xv. 49 (Sir. 11, 5; Palaeph. 52, 4). In the classics the usual form is *φορήσω*; yet even Isaeus has *φορέσαι*, see Bttm. II. 315. (On the other hand *εὐφόρησεν* Luke xii. 16.) On *ἀπολέσω* and *ἐπαυνέσω*, see below, § 15.

§ 14. RARE INFLECTIONS OF VERBS IN MI AND OF IRREGULAR VERBS.

75 1. Of verbs in *μι* we find:

7th ed. a. Pluper. Act. *ἐστήκεσαν* Rev. vii. 11 var. for *ἐστήκεισαν*; cf. Thuc. 1, 15 *ξυνεστήκεσαν*, Xen. An. 1, 4, 4 *ἐφεστήκεσαν*, Heliod. 4, 16 *ἐψέκεσαν*, cf. particularly Jacobs, Achill. Tat. pp. 400, 622; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 77.

b. 3d Per. Plur. Pres. *τιθέασι* for *τιθεῖσι* Matt. v. 15, *περιτιθέασι* Mark xv. 17, *ἐπιτιθέασι* Matt. xxiii. 4. This is the better and more usual form; cf. Thuc. 2, 34; Aristot. Metaph. 11. 1; Theophr. plant. 2, 6; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 145 sq., who adduces many instances, and Mtth. I. 483; Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 250. Similarly *διδόασι* Rev. xvii. 13, according to the best Codd.; cf. Her. I. 93; Thuc. I. 42. The contracted forms *τιθεῖσι* and especially *διδούσι* belong to the later language; Lob. p. 244.

c. In the Imperf. the 3d Per. Plur. has the contracted form *ἐδίδουν* for *ἐδίδοσαν* in compounds, Acts iv. 33; xxvii. 1; cf. Hesiod. *ἔργ.* 123. In the Sing. the form *ἐδίδουν* is more common; Bttm. I. 509.

d. On the abbreviated but very (perhaps only) common Inf. Perf. Act. *ἐστάναι* (for *ἐστηκέναι*) 1 Cor. x. 12, see Bttm. II. 26 f., cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 182 sq.

e. The Imperative Pres. Pass. in several Codd. is *περιύτασο* 2 Tim. ii. 16; Tit. iii. 9 (*ἀφίστασο* 1 Tim. vi. 5 var.) for which *περιύτω* etc. is more usual; see Th. M. p. 75; Mtth. I. 495.

f. There are weighty authorities for forms like *ιστῶμεν* Rom. 91 iii. 31, *συνιστώντες* 2 Cor. vi. 4; x. 18 (Niceph. Bryenn. p. 41, cf. *καθιστών* Agath. 316, 2), *ἀποκαθιστᾶ* Mark ix. 12 (Dan. ii. 21; 2 Sam. xviii. 12; Fabric. Pseudep. II. 610; *ξυνιστᾶ* Plat. Tim. 33 a.) from the form *ιστάω* (Her. 4, 103, as *ἀφιστάω* Joa. Cinnam. p. 121, *ἐφιστάω* p. 65, *καθιστάω* p. 104); see Grammatici graeci, ed. Dind. I. 251; Dorville, Charit. p. 542; Mtth. I. 482. Similarly *ἐμπιπλῶν* (from *ἐμπιπλάω*) Acts xiv. 17, cf. *ἐμπιπρόν* Leo Diac. 2, 1.

g. Optat. Pres. *δῆψ* for *δοίη* Rom. xv. 5; 2 Tim. i. 16, 18 (ii. 7); Eph. i. 17; iii. 16; Jno. xv. 16, *ἀποδῆψ* 2 Tim. iv. 14. This is a

later form, (in Plat. Gorg. 481 a., Lys. c., Andoc. p. 215, T. IV. 78 recent editors have restored δῶ, and in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 35 even ^{6th ed.} Schneider changed δῶνς into δούης), see Sept. Gen. xxvii. 28; xxviii. 4; Num. v. 21; xi. 29, etc., Themist. or. 8, p. 174 d.; Philostr. Apoll. 1. 34; Dio Chr. 20. 267; Aristetas, p. 120, Haverc. etc., which the ancient grammarians reject (Phryn. p. 345; Moeris p. 117); cf. Lob. 346; Sturz, 52; Bttm. in Mus. antiq. stud. I. 238.¹

h. From βαίνω, 2d Aor. ἔβην, we find the Imperative ἀνάβα Rev. ⁷⁶ 76 iv. 1, κατάβα Mark xv. 30 var. (on the contrary κατάβηθι Matt. ^{7th ed.} xxvii. 40; Jno. iv. 49, μετάβηθι vii. 3; cf. Thom. Mag. p. 495, and Oudendorp, h. l.). Similarly Eurip. Electr. 113; Aristoph. Acharn. 262, and Vesp. 979; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 153 sq.; Bttm. II. 125. Quite analogous is ἀνάστα Acts xii. 7; Eph. v. 14; cf. Theocrit. 24, 36; Menand. p. 48; Mein. Aesop. 62, de Fur. (but ἀνάστηθι Acts ix. 6, 34, ἐπίστηθι 2 Tim. iv. 2), also ἀπόστα protev. Jac. 2., παράστα Acta apocr. 51.

i. The N. T. Codd. vary as to the form of the Perf. Part. Neut. of ἵστημι. Yet the better Codd. have in the two passages Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14 [A. C. Sin. also in Rev. xiv. 1] ἑστώς (ἑστηκός), exactly as the oldest and best Codd. of Greek authors (Bttm. II. 208), and this form Bekker in Plato prefers throughout. Elsewhere the uncontracted forms of this participle not unfrequently occur in good MSS. of the N. T., as Matt. xxvii. 47 ἑστηκότων Mark ix. 1; xi. 5, ἑστηκός Jno. iii. 29; vi. 22, παρεστηκόσιν Mark xiv. 69, and, for the most part, have been received into the text.

The (pretty well attested) form δώσῃ Jno. xvii. 2; Rev. viii. 3 (xiii. 16 δώσωσιν) occurs also Theocrit. 27, 21, and is, according to some, Doric. In Theocrit. indeed it has for a long time been corrected to δώσει; yet δώσῃ occurs often enough in later writers (Lob. 721; cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 871; Index ad Theophan.), and probably may be classed among the corrupt forms in which the popular speech indulged.

2. From εἶμι we find:

92

a. The Imperat. ἦτω for ἔστω (which in the N. T. is also the usual form) 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Jas. v. 12 (Ps. civ. 31; 1 Macc. x. 31; cf. Clem. Alex. Strom. 6, 275; Acta Thom. 3, 7) Bttm. I. 529; only once in Plato, rep. 2, 361 d., see Schneider, h. l. According to Heraclides (in Eustath. p. 1411, 22) the inflection is Doric. The other Imperative form ἴσθι occurs in Matt. ii. 13; v. 25; Mark v. 34; Luke xix. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 15 (Bttm. I. 527).

¹ This form is surprising also in the N. T., as it everywhere stands where otherwise according to the idiom of the N. T. the Subjunctive would stand.

b. The form *ἤμην* Imperf. Mid. 1st Per. Sing. (Bttm. I. 527), which is rejected by the Atticists and became quite usual (particularly with *άν*, as in the N. T. once in Gal. i. 10) only in later writers (Lob. 152; Schäf. Long. 423; Valcken. in N. T. I. 478); is the common form; as, Matt. xxv. 35; Jno. xi. 15; Acts x. 30; xi. 5, 17; 1 Cor. xiii. 11, etc.; cf. Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 3; *ἤμεθα* for *ἤμεν* occurs (Matt. xxiii. 30) twice in very good Codd., and has already been received into the text by Griesbach. Also Acts xxvii. 37; Lchm., agreeably to A [Sin.] and B, adopted it. On the other hand, in Gal. iv. 3; Eph. ii. 3 it has little authority. The form does not occur in any good writer; yet see Epiphan. Opp. II. 333; Malal. 16, p. 404.

c. For *ἦσθα* Mark xiv. 67, Codd. of little weight have *ἦς*, rare in Attic, and almost doubtful (Bttm. I. 528). As to its use in later Greek, see Lob. 149.

77 Note. *ἐν* Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; Jas. i. 17 (doubtful in 1 Cor. vi. 5),
cf. Sir. 37, 2, is usually considered (with the ancient grammarians, cf. Schol. ad Aristoph. Nub. 482) to be contracted from *ἐνεστι*, and this opinion is defended also by Fr. Mr. p. 642. It is probably better, however, with Bttm. II. 375, to take it for the preposition *ἐν* (*έν*, *ένι* with the accent thrown back) which, like *ἐπι*, *πάρα*, etc., is used without *εἶναι*; as the supposed contraction would be harsh, and without example. Bttm.'s view, moreover, is supported by the analogy of *ἐπι* and *πάρα*, the latter of which can hardly be a contraction from *πάρεστι*, cf. Krü. 26. This *ἐν* is very frequent in Attic, both in poetry and prose; Georgi, Hierocr. I. 152; Schwarz, Comm. 486. The poets use it for *ἐνεσσι*, as *ἐπι* for *ἐπεσσι*, Il. 20, 248; Odys. 9, 126; *πάρα*, however, is connected even with the 1st Person.¹

3. With the primitive verb *ἔημι* the following forms are connected:

a. *ἀφένωνται* Matt. ix. 2, 5; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20, 23; vii. 47; 1 Jno. ii. 12. Ancient grammarians are not agreed in accounting 93 for this form. Some, as Eustathius (Iliad, 6, 590) consider it equivalent to *ἀφώνται*, in the same way as *ἀφέν* is used by Homer for *ἀφῆ*. Others, more correctly, take it for the Preterite (instead of *ἀφένωνται*); so Herodian, the Etymol. Mag. and Suidas, — yet with this difference, that the last ascribes it to the Doric dialect, the author of the Etymol. to the Attic. Suidas is undoubtedly

¹ The Etymol. M. p. 357, regards *ἐν*, not as a contraction of *ἐνεστι*, but as an ellipsis, requiring the suitable person of the verb *εἶναι* to be supplied. Moreover, whether *ἐν* also occurs for *ἐνι*, is doubtful, Hm. Soph. Trach. 1020.

right; and this Perf. Pass. is traceable to the Perf. Act. ἀφέωκα, cf. Fischer, de vitiis lex. p. 646 sqq.; Bttm. I. 521.

b. ἤφιε Mark i. 34; xi. 16 (Philo leg. ad Cajum p. 1021) is the Imperf. of ἀφίω (cf. ἀφίω Eccl. ii. 18, and ἀφίωμεν Matt. vi. 12 var.), like ξύνιον for ξυνίεσαν Iliad, 1, 273 (Bttm. I. 523), with the Augm. on the preposition (which occurs elsewhere also in this verb, as ἠφέλθη Plutarch, Sulla 28) for ἀφίει (Bttm. I. 521) see Fischer, Weller. II. 480.

c. The 1st Aor. Pass. of ἀφίημι in Rom. iv. 7 (Ps. xxxii. 1) according to most Codd. is ἀφέθησαν. Some Codd., however, here and in Sept. give ἀφελθησαν with Augm. which is the usual form in Greek authors (Bttm. I. 541).

In Rev. ii. 20 ἀφ᾽ς (Exod. xxxii. 32) from ἀφίω has on the authority 75 of good Codd. been received into the text, like τρεῖς for τριῶς Bttm. I. 506. 8th ed.

From συνίημι we have συνιῶσι Matt. xiii. 13 (3d Per. Plur.), 2 Cor. x. 12 (either 3d Plur. or Dative Participle) and Participle συνίων Matt. xiii. 23 var. (Rom. iii. 11, from Sept. συνίων) for συνιείς, which Lchm. and Tdf. have in the text. The first form is from συνιέω, (which still survives in the Inf. συνιῶν, Theogn. 565). The Participial form, however, especially common in Sept. (1 Chron. xxv. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Ps. xl. 2; 78 Jer. xx. 12) would perhaps more correctly be written συνίων (from συνίω, see above, and Bttm. I. 523). Accordingly Lchm. has printed συνιῶσι Matt. xiii. 13. Cf. in general Fr. Rom. I. 174 seq. 78

4. From the verb κάθημαι we find Imperat. κάθου Matt. xxii. 44; Luke xx. 42; Acts ii. 34; Jas. ii. 3 (1 Sam. i. 23; xxii. 5; 2 Kings ii. 2, 6, etc.) instead of κάθησο. Only in Mark xii. 36 has Tdf. adopted from B κάθισον. The form κάθου never occurs in the earlier Greek authors, and therefore Moeris p. 234 and Thom. M. p. 485 class it among spurious forms. So also κάθη for κάθησαι Acts xxiii. 3 (Lob. 395; Greg. Cor. ed. Schäf. p. 411).

Not a few verbs present in the N. T. single forms, regularly constructed, which are rejected for the most part by ancient grammarians, on the ground that they do not occur in Greek authors, or only in the later. Among such forms are reckoned in particular a number of Futures Active, for which standard writers use the Futures Middle (Bttm. II. 84 f.; Monk, Eurip. Alcest. v. 159, 645); but this subject has not yet been completely investigated. We subjoin a list of all such forms as have been declared unclassical,

but mark with an asterisk those about which the grammarians, and in particular Thom. Mag. and Moeris, have been manifestly too fastidious.

ἀγγέλλω. The 2d Aor. Active and Passive, rare in the better authors, are in many passages suspicious, Bttm. II. 94 f.; yet, see Schäf. Demosth. III. 175; Schoem. Isae. p. 39. In the N. T. we find ἀνγγέλη 1 Pet. i. 12, and (from the Sept.) Rom. xv. 21, διαγγελῇ (from Sept.) Rom. ix. 17, κατηγορέλη Acts xvii. 13.

ἀγνυμι. On the Fut. κατεύξει Matt. xii. 20 and Aor. κατέαξα see § 12, 2.

* **ἄγω.** On the 1st Aor. ἦξα, which occurs 2 Pet. ii. 5 in the compound ἐπάξας, see Bttm. II. 98; Lob. p. 287, 735. In compounds also the form is not rare (2 Sam. xxii. 35; 1 Macc. ii. 67; Index to Malal. under ἄγω; Schäf. ind. ad Aesop. p. 135) even in good
76 prose authors Her. 1, 190; 5, 34; Xen. Hell. 2, 2, 20; Thuc. 2,
old ed. 97; 8, 25.

* **αἰρέω.** The Fut. ἐλῶ, in comp. ἀφελῶ Rev. xxii. 19, is rare, see Bttm. II. 100. Yet it is found in Agath. 269, 5, and in the Sept. frequently: Exod. v. 8; Num. xi. 17; Deut. xii. 32; Job xxxvi. 7; cf. also Menand. Byz. p. 316. In opposition to Reisig,
79 Comm. crit. in Soph. Oed. C. p. 365, who claims it for Aristoph.
old ed. and Soph., see Hm. Oed. Col. 1454 and Eurip. Hel. p. 127.

* **ἀκούω.** Fut. ἀκούσω Matt. xii. 19; xiii. 14; Rom. x. 14; Jno. xvi. 13, for ἀκούσομαι, which even in the N. T. is the more frequent, particularly with Luke, as Acts iii. 22 (vii. 37); xvii. 32; xxv. 22; xxviii. 28, also Jno. v. 28. Ἀκούσω occurs not only in poets (Anthol. gr. III. 134; Jac. Orac. Sibyll. 8, 206, 345), but occasionally also in prose authors of the κοινή, as Dion. H. 980, 4. Reisk., cf. Schäf. Demosth. II. 232; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 153; Bachmann, Lycophr. I. 92. In Sept. cf. Isa. vi. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 16.

95 **ἄλλομαι** varies between Aor. ἠλάμην and ἠλόμην Bttm. II. 108. The same variation exists in the Codd. Acts xiv. 10 (even with double λ), yet ἦλατο preponderates.

ἀμαρτάνω, ἀμαρτέω. 1st Aor. ἡμάρτησα for 2d Aor. ἡμαρτον Rom. v. 14, 16; Matt. xviii. 15; Luke xvii. 4; Rom. vi. 15 (1 Sam. xix. 4; Lam. iii. 41¹) Thom. M. p. 420; Lob. p. 732; yet see Diod. S. 2, 14 ἀμαρτήσας, Agath. 167, 18. Also the Fut. Act. ἀμαρτήσω Matt. xviii. 21 (Sir. vii. 36; xxiv. 22; Dio Ch. 59, 20) is not very common. Cf. Monk, Eurip. Alcest. 159; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 361.

¹ Still, in the Sept. the 2d Aor. ἡμαρτον predominates. See especially 1 Kings viii. 47, ἡμάρτομεν, ἠνομήσαμεν, ἠδικήσαμεν.

**ἀνέχομαι*. Fut. *ἀνέξομαι* Matt. xvii. 17; Mark ix. 19; Luke ix. 41; 2 Tim. iv. 3, for which Moeris from pure caprice would have *ἀνασχέσομαι*. The former occurs very frequently; cf. e.g. Soph. Elect. 1017; Xen. C. 5, 1, 26; Plat. Phaedr. 239 a.

ἀνοίγω. 1st Aor. *ἤνοιξα* Jno. ix. 17, 21, etc. for *ἀνέωξα* (yet cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 5, 13), 2d Aor. Pass. *ἠνόγη* Rev. xv. 5, see § 12, 7.

ἀπαντάω. Fut. *ἀπαντήσω* (for *ἀπαντήσομαι*) Mark xiv. 13 (Diod. S. 18, 15). See Bttm. II. 114; Mthh. Eurip. Suppl. 774.

ἀποκτείνω. 1st Aor. *ἀπεκτάνθη*, *ἀποκτανθῆναι* Rev. ii. 13; ix. 18, 20; xi. 13; xiii. 10; xix. 21; Matt. xvi. 21; Luke ix. 22, etc.; cf. 1 Macc. ii. 9; 2 Macc. iv. 36. This form occurs indeed in Homer, but belongs peculiarly to later Greek prose (Dio C. 65, c. 4; Menander, Hist. p. 284, 304, Bonn ed.). See Bttm. II. 227, Lob. 36, 757.¹ (For the un-Attic Perf. *ἀπέκταγκα* see 2 Sam. iv. 11; Bttm. 226 f.)

ἀπόλλυμι. Fut. *ἀπολέσω* Matt. xxi. 41; Mark viii. 35; Jno. 80 vi. 39; xii. 25; cf. Lucian. asin. 33; Long. pastor. 3, 17; Bttm. II. 254. Yet see Lob. 746. (In 1 Cor. i. 19, we find the regular form *ἀπολώ*.)

ἄρπάζω. Aor. *ἤρπάγην* 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4 for *ἤρπασθην* (Rev. xii. 5) Thom. Mag. p. 424; Moeris, p. 50; Bttm. I. 372, Fut. *ἄρπαγίσσομαι* 1 Thess. iv. 17. (Also *ἄρπάσω* for *ἄρπάσομαι* Jno. x. 28 is said to be a rare form; it occurs, however, in Xen. mag. eq. 4, 17.)

**αὔξάνω*. The primitive form *αὔξω* Eph. ii. 21; Col. ii. 19 is frequent in Plato and Xen., Mthh. 541.

βαρέω. From this comes not only *βεβαρημένος* Matt. xxvi. 43; 96 Luke ix. 32, but also, contrary to Attic prose usage (Bttm. II. 88), *βαρούμενοι* 2 Cor. v. 4 (Mark xiv. 40), *βαρελσθω* 1 Tim. v. 16, and the Aor. *ἐβαρήθην* Luke xxi. 34; 2 Cor. i. 8, for which last the Greek literary diction employs *ἐβαρύνθην* (var. Luke as above).

βασκαίνω. The Aor. Gal. iii. 1 is given in text. rec. *ἐβάσκανε*, but in many Codd. *ἐβάσκηνε* (without an *ι* subs.); cf. Bttm. I. 438. The latter in Dio C. 44, 39; Herod. 2, 4, 11, and the later writers.

¹ *Ἀποκτείνεσθαι* (others *ἀποκτείνεσθαι*) occurring in Rev. vi. 11, and *ἀποκτείνει* (*ἀποκτενεί* var.) in 2 Cor. iii. 6 (Rev. xiii. 10) are considered as Aeolic, the Aeolians being accustomed to change *ε* before *λ, μ, ν, ρ, σ* into *ε*, and double the following consonant; therefore, *κτείνω* for *κτείνω*, like *σπέρβω* for *σπείρω*, Koenig, Gregor. Cor. pp. 587, 597 Schaeff., Mthh. I. 74; cf. Dindorf, praef. ad Aristoph. XII. p. 14. Also in Tob. i. 18; Wisd. xvi. 14, we find the first form among the var. A Present *ἀποκτείνω* is probably not, with Wahl, to be assumed for Matt. x. 28 and Luke xii. 4; xiii. 34. *Ἀποκτενόντων* in those passages (if not to be taken for an Aor. Particip., see Fr. Mt. p. 383) may be considered as a corruption of *ἀποκτενόντων*, which a few, but good, Codd. have, and which Lchm. and, in part, Tdf. have printed. Cf. besides, Bornem. ad Luc. p. 81.

βιόω. 1st Aor. Inf. *βιώσαι* in 1 Pet. iv. 2, for which the 2d Aor. *βιώναι* is more usual in Attic, Bttm. II. 130 f., yet see Aristot. Nic. 9, 8; Plutarch. Opp. II. 367 f., and often in compounds, Steph. Thes. II. 260, ed. nov. The other forms of the 1st Aor. are more frequent, the participle *βιώσας* the most so.

βλαστάνω. Aor. *ἐβλάστησα* for *ἐβλαστον* Matt. xiii. 26; Jas. v. 18 (Gen. i. 11; Num. xvii. 8, etc.; Acta apoc. p. 172); cf. Bttm. II. 131. Since Aristotle's time the form is not unusual even in the Greek literary language; Stephani Thes. II. 273.

* **γαμέω.** Aor. *ἐγάμησα* Mark vi. 17; Matt. xxii. 25; 1 Cor. vii. 9 stands for the older form *ἐγημα* (from *γάμω*), as Luke xiv. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 28; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 29; Lob. 742. Yet *ἐγάμησα* is found (if not in Xen. Cyr. 8, 4, 20) Lucian, dial. deor. 5, 4; Apollodor. 3, 15, 3. Better attested is *ἐγαμήθην* Mark x. 12 (though not fully established), 1 Cor. vii. 39; Lob. 742.

γελάω. Fut. *γελάσω* (for *γελάσομαι*) Luke vi. 21. See Bttm. II. 85, 134.

γίγνομαι. Aor. Pass. *ἐγενήθην* for *ἐγενόμην* Acts iv. 4; Col. iv. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 14, etc.; cf. Thom. M. p. 189,—an originally Doric form frequently found in the writers of the *κοινή*, Lob. 109; Bttm. II. 136.

δίδωμι. The 1st Aor. *ἔδωκα* is avoided in the 1st and 2d Per. Plur. by Attic writers, and the 2d Aor. used instead, Bttm. I. 509. 78 In the N. T., however, we find *ἔδωκαμεν* 1 Thess. iv. 2, *ἔδωκατε* 7th ed. Matt. xxv. 35; Gal. iv. 15, etc. as in Demosth. On *δώση* see § 14, 1 Remark p. 79.

* **διώκω.** Fut. *διώξω* for *διώξομαι* Matt. xxiii. 34; Luke xxi. 12; 81 Bttm. II. 154. Yet cf. Dem. Nausim. 633 c.; Xen. An. 1, 4, 8 7th ed. (Krü. h. l.); Cyr. 6, 3, 13.

δύναμαι. We have merely to remark here that besides the Aor. *ἐδυνήθην*, the (Ion.) form *ἠδυνάσθην*, with the Augm. *η* too, is noted from B among the var. Matt. xvii. 16 (Bttm. II. 155).

δύω, δύνω. In several good Codd. we find Mark i. 32 the 1st 97 Aor. *ἔδυσα*, which among the earlier Greeks has only a causative meaning, Bttm. II. 156. On the other hand the 1st Aor. *δύναντος*, as inferior authorities give in Luke iv. 40, is found also Ael. 4, 1; Pausan. 2, 11, 7.

εἶδω in the sense of *know*. Pret. *οἶδαμεν* Mark xi. 33; Jno. iii. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 1, etc. for *ἴσμεν* (Poppo, Xen. An. 2, 4, 6), *οἶδατε* Mark x. 38; xiii. 33; 1 Cor. ix. 13; Phil. iv. 15 for *ἴστε*, *οἶδασιν* Luke xi. 44; Jno. x. 5 for *ἴσασι*; see Bttm. I. 546 (yet cf. Aristoph. av.

599; Xen. Oec. 20, 14). The 2d Per. Sing. *οἶδας* 1 Cor. vii. 16; Jno. xxi. 15 is rather Ionic and Doric (for *οἶσθα*), yet it occurs Her. 4, 157; Xen. M. 4, 6, 6; Eurip. Alc. 790, and frequently in later Greek; see Lob. 236 sq. The 3d Per. Plur. of the Plup. is written *ἤδεισαν* Mark i. 84; Jno. ii. 9; xxi. 4, etc. for *ἤδεσαν*; Bttm. I. 547.

εἶπεῖν (2d Aor. *εἶπον*). 1st Aor. *εἶπα* in the N. T. in the 2d Per. Sing. Matt. xxvi. 25; Mark xii. 32, and frequently. This person also occurs in Attic, Xen. Oec. 19, 14; Soph. Oed. C. 1509 (along with *εἶπες*, as often in Plato); but it is originally Ionic, see Greg. Corinth. ed. Schäf. p. 481; Schäf. Dion. H. p. 436 sq. Imper. *εἶπατε* Matt. x. 27; xxi. 5; Col. iv. 17, *εἰπάτωσαν* Acts xxiv. 20; likewise very common in Attic, Plat. Lach. 187 d; Xen. C. 8, 2, 28. We find, besides, in good Codd. 3d Per. Plur. Indic. *εἶπαν* Matt. xii. 2; xvii. 24; Mark xi. 6; xii. 7, 16; Luke v. 33; xix. 39; xx. 2; Acts i. 11, 24; vi. 2; xxviii. 21, etc. (Diod. S. 16, 14; Xen. H. 3, 5, 24 a var.), the Participle *εἶπας* Acts vii. 37; xxii. 24 which is chiefly Ionic, and even the more unusual 1st Per. *εἶπα* Heb. iii. 10; Acts xxvi. 15 (*εἶπον*, on the contrary, predominates in the N. T.); see Sturz, dial. alex. p. 61.¹ Recent editors have adopted these forms wherever they are attested by several Codd. In composition we find *ἀπειπάμην* 2 Cor. iv. 2 (Her. 6, 100), and *προεἶπαμεν* 1 Thess. iv. 6 (*εἶπαμεν* in the 1. Turin. Papyrus, p. 10). *Εἰπόν* (not *εἶπον*, see § 6, 1, k.) Acts xxviii. 26 (according to good Codd.) is to be regarded as 2d Aor. Imperative, a form which we now find also in the text of Mark xiii. 4; Luke x. 40, while in other passages *εἰπέ* preponderates. The 1st Aor. Pass. of this verb, *ἐρρήθην* (from *ρέω*, see Bttm. II. 166), is sometimes written in MSS. of the N. T. Matt. v. 21, 31, 33 *ἐρρέθην*, as often in Codd. of later (non-Attic) authors, though this form occasionally appears in Attic writers also; Lob. 447 (but not in Plato, see Schneider, Plat. civ. II. p. 5 sq.).

ἐκχέω, later form *ἐκχύνω* (Lob. 726). From it comes Fut. *ἐκχεῶ* for *ἐκχεύσω* Bttm. I. 396. See § 13, 3. a. p. 77.

* *ἐλεάω* for *ἐλεέω* occurs in several good Codd. in various passages of the N. T., as Rom. ix. 16, 18 *ἐλεώντος*, *ἐλεᾷ*, Jude 23 *ἐλεᾷτε*. 98 Also Clem. Al. p. 54, Sylb. (the Florent. edition) has *ἐλεᾷ*. Cf. also Etymol. M. 327, 30. Similar is *ἐλλογᾶν* Rom. v. 13; Philem. 18, also in good Codd. The latter has been adopted by Lchm.,

¹ *Εἶπαν* occurs also in the well-known Rosetta inscription, at the end of line 8.

and after him by Tdf. Fr., Rom. I. 311, declares all these forms to be errors in copying.

ἐλκω. From this we find, as regularly in Greek authors, a Pres. and an Imperf. Jas. ii. 6; Acts xxi. 30. On the other hand, for the Fut. *ἐλξω* (Mtth. 573) the more unusual *ἐλκίσω* occurs Jno. xii. 32 from the other form *ἐλκίω*; cf. Job xxxix. 10.

**ἐπαινέω*. Fut. *ἐπαινέσω* 1 Cor. xi. 22, for *ἐπαινέσομαι*; see Bttm. I. 388. Yet cf. Xen. An. 5, 5, 8; Himer. 20. In general, however, this form is not uncommon; see Brunck; Gnom. p. 10, 64; Schaef. Demosth. II. 465; Stallb. Plat. Symp. p. 139.

**ἐπιορκέω*. Fut. *ἐπιορκήσω* for *ἐπιορκήσομαι* Matt. v. 33. See Bttm. II. 85.

ἔρχομαι. The Fut. *ἐλεύσομαι*, both in the simple verb and its compounds, is of frequent occurrence, but particularly in later prose authors (Arrian. Al. 6, 12; Philostr. Apoll. 4, 4; Dio Chr. 33, 410; Max. Tyr. 24, p. 295); in Attic, on the contrary, *εἶμι* is used instead (Phryn. p. 37 sq.; Thom. M. p. 88, 336). Yet in the earlier authors *ἐλεύσομαι* also is not altogether infrequent, Her. 1, 142; 5, 125; Lys. Dardan. 12 (p. 233, Bremi); see in general Lob. 37 sq.; Schaef. Soph. II. 323; cf. Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. 210. Instead of the Imperf. *ἔρχόμεν* Mark i. 45; ii. 13; Jno. iv. 30; vi. 17, etc. Attic authors commonly use the Imperf. of *εἶμι*, Bttm. II. 183; yet see Bornem. Luc. p. 106, cf. Thuc. 4, 120, 121; Xen. An. 4, 6, 22. In Attic the imperatives *ἔθι*, *ἔτε* from *εἶμι* are used for *ἔρχου*, *ἔρχεσθε* Jno. i. 47. Also *ἐρχόμενος* is said to be rare in earlier Attic, Bttm. as above; yet it occurs in Plato, Crit. c. 15. (*ἦλθε* for *ἐλήλυθε* Gal. iv. 4; Jno. xix. 39, etc. has been too hastily rejected by Thom. M. p. 418; see Sallier on the passage.)

ἔσθίω. From the poetic form *ἔσθω* (Bttm. II. 185) we find the Participle *ἔσθων* among the var. Mark i. 6; Luke vii. 33, 34; x. 7; xx. 47; xxii. 30, which Tdf., on the authority of (a few) good Codd., has received into the text; see Praef. p. 21. From Sept. cf. Lev. xvii. 10; xix. 26; Sir. xx. 16.

εὐρίσκω. Aor. Mid. *εὐράμην* for *εὐρόμην* Heb. ix. 12, see § 13, 1 (Paus. 7, 11, 1; 8, 30, 4, etc.; cf. Lob. p. 139 sq.). A 1st Aor.

εὔρησα appears in the Subjunctive form *εὐρήσης* Rev. xviii. 14 and 99 *εὐρήσωσιν* ix. 6 (as at least many Codd. have it), unless we take 83 these forms for the Subjunctive Fut. (see § 13, 1. e). Lob. 721, 7th ed. however, produces a Participle *εὐρήσαντος*.

80 *ζάω*. Fut. *ζήσω* Rom. vi. 2, 8; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 11; 6th ed. Jno. vi. 51, 58 f. (*συζήσω* Rom. vi. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 11), *ζήσομαι* Matt.

iv. 4; Mark v. 23; Jno. vi. 51; xi. 25, etc. 1st Aor. ἔζησα Rev. ii. 8; Luke xv. 24; Rom. vii. 9, etc. (and often in Sept.). These are principally later forms, which occur but seldom in early authors (see Bttm. II. 192). The Aor. is peculiar to later writers. Earlier authors used in the Fut. and Aor. the corresponding tenses of βιώω.

ἦκω. From the 1st Aor. ἦξα, a later form, Bttm. II. 194; Lob. 744, we find the Subjunctive ἦξωσι Rev. iii. 9, where, however, better Codd. have the Fut. ἦξουσι. The Preter. ἦκα (Deut. xxxii. 17; Phot. biblioth. 222; Malal. pp. 136 and 137; Leo Gramm. p. 98, etc.; Lob. 744) in the form ἦκασι Mark viii. 3 is by no means established, though Lehm. has adopted it.

θάλλω. 2d Aor. ἀνεθάλετε Phil. iv. 10, a form not occurring in prose, and everywhere rare, Bttm. II. 195.

ἴστημι. The Pres. ἰστάνω Rom. iii. 31, and in composition συνιστάνω 2 Cor. iii. 1 (iv. 2); v. 12; vi. 4; x. 12, 18; Gal. ii. 18, was used in Attic (Mtth. I. 482), but more frequently in later Greek (e.g. Cinnam. 214 and 256 ἐφιστάνειν). On the later form ἰστώω see § 14, 1, f. p. 78.

κατακαίω. Fut. κατακάησομαι 1 Cor. iii. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 10 (from Aor. κατεκάην Her. 1, 51; 4, 79) for κατακαυθήσομαι Rev. xviii. 8, which the Attics use, see Thom. M. p. 511; Bttm. II. 211.

καταλείπω. 1st Aor. κατέλειψα Acts vi. 2; Lob. 714.

κεράννυμι. Perf. Pass. κεκέρασμαι Rev. xiv. 10, for the more usual κέκραμαι; see Bttm. II. 214. Analogous is the Participle συγκεκρασμένους Heb. iv. 2, in very good Codd.

κερδαίνω. Aor. ἐκέρδησα Matt. xxv. 20; xviii. 15, κερδήσαι Acts. xxvii. 21, κερδήσας Luke ix. 25, κερδήσω Subj. 1 Cor. ix. 19, 20; Matt. xvi. 26 and frequently, forms peculiar to Ionic prose, Bttm. II. 215; Lob. 740. In Attic the verb is inflected regularly; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 21.

κλαίω. Fut. κλαύσω (properly Doric) for κλαύσομαι (as in Sept. always) Luke vi. 25; Jno. xvi. 20; Rev. xviii. 9; cf. Babr. 98, 9; Bttm. II. 85, 220.

κλέπτω. Fut. κλέψω for κλέψομαι Matt. xix. 18; Rom. xiii. 9, Bttm. II. 85, 221. In Sept. never, but in Lucian, dial. deor. 7, 4.

κράζω. Fut. κράξω Luke xix. 40 according to good authorities for κεκράξομαι (as always in Sept.), Aor. ἐκραξα for ἐκραγον Matt. 100 viii. 29; xx. 30, etc., Bttm. II. 223.

*κρέμαμαι. The form ἐξεκρέμετο Luke xix. 48 in Codd. B [and Sin.] of which Griesb. and Schulz take no notice, is undoubtedly a mistake of the transcriber. Lehm. also has not noticed it.

84 *κρύπτω*. 2d Aor. Act. *ἔκρυβον* Luke i. 24 (Phot. bibliothec.
7th ed. I. p. 143, Bekk.), see Bttm. II. 226.

κύω (*to be pregnant*) has the Fut. and Aor. regular in the forms *κνήσω*, *ἐκνήσα* (Bttm. II. 230). So Jas. i. 18 *ἀπεκύνσε*. In the Pres. *κνέω* occurs, but not, as Eustath. p. 1548, 20 insists, only in the sense of *bring forth*; see Lob. Aiac. p. 182 sq. and paralip. 556.

81 Hence in Jas. i. 15 *ἀποκνεῖ* may be written as well as *ἀποκύνει*, but
6th ed. it is not necessary to prefer the former on account of the form of the Aorist in vs. 18. The N. T. Lexicons recognize only the form *κνέω*.

λάσκω. To this belongs the Aor. *ἐλάκησα* Acts i. 18, usually referred to the Doric Pres. *λακέω*; but Bttm. II. 233 derives it directly from the 2d Aor. *λακύν*, universally in use in Attic.

* *μιαίνω* has Tit. i. 15, according to good Codd., in the Perf. Participle *μεμιασμένοι* for the usual *μεμιασμένοι*, cf. Lob. 35.

νίπτω Jno. xiii. 6, 14, *νίπτομαι* Matt. xv. 2. Instead of this Pres. the earlier writers use *νίζω*; see Bttm. II. 249; Lob. 241.

οἰκτείρω. Fut. *οἰκτειρήσω* Rom. ix. 15 (as if from *οἰκτειρέω*) for *οἰκτερῶ*; cf. Ps. ci. 15; Jer. xxi. 7; Mic. vii. 19, etc.; also in the Byzantines, see Lob. 741.

δμνύω for *δμνυμι* (Bttm. II. 255) Matt. xxiii. 20 ff.; xxvi. 74; Heb. vi. 16; Jas. v. 12. But in the better MSS. we find Mark xiv. 71 *δμνύναι* for *δμνύειν*, and Griesb. received it into the text.

* *όρώω*. Imperf. Mid. *ώρώμην* Acts ii. 25 (from Ps. xvi.), for which *έωρώμην* was used in Attic (Bttm. I. 325). From *δπτεσθαι* we find Luke xiii. 28, though not without var., the 1st Aor. Subj. *δψησθε*, which occurs in Liban. and the Byzantines; see Lob. 784.

παίζω. Aor. *ένέπαιξα* Matt. xx. 19; xxvii. 31 (Sept. Prov. xxiii. 35), for which in Attic *έπαισα* was used; see Bttm. I. 372. But *έπαιξα*, *παίζαι* Lucian, dial. deor. 6, 4, and encom. Demosth. 15; cf. V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 378; and Lob. 240. The Fut. *παίξω* Anacr. 24, 8.

πέτομαι. Part. *πετόμενον* Rev. xiv. 6 in B for *πετόμενον*, from the form *πετάομαι* which occurs only in Ionic (Her. 3, 111) and later writers (e.g. Lucian, dial. mort. 15, 3 var.), see Bttm. II. 271. The Pres. *πέταμαι*, found even in Pindar, is cited by Wetst. and Matthäi among the var. Rev. xii. 14.

101 *πίνω*. From the Fut. *πίομαι* the complete form *πίεσαι* is established in Luke xvii. 8 (Bttm. I. 347), as in the very same passage *φάγεσαι* from *φάγομαι*. Both are found also in Ezek. xii. 18; Ruth ii. 9, 14. On the Inf. *πῖν* Jno. iv. 9, which on the

authority of good Codd. [also Sin.*] Lehm. and Tdf. [ed. II.] have inserted in the text, see Fr. de crit. conformat. etc. p. 27 sq. Only the form *πεῖν* is found in later writers, and this reading of several 85 Codd. [and Tdf. ed. VII.] might perhaps be adopted, if at least 7th ed. Cod. A vs. 7, 10 had not distinctly *πιεῖν*, thus showing *πῖν* vs. 9 to be a mistake of the transcriber.

πίπτω. Aor. *ἔπεσα*, see § 13, 1 p. 73.

ρέω. Fut. *ρεύσω* Jno. vii. 38 for *ρεύσομαι*. In Attic, however, *ῥύησομαι* is the usual form, Lob. 739; Bttm. II. 287. (As to the 1st Aor. *ῥευσάτωσαν* Cant. iv. 16, also used only in later Greek, cf. Lob. 739.) The regular and usual 2d Aor. *ἔρρύν* occurs in the compound *παραινῶμεν* Heb. ii. 1.

σαλπίζω. Fut. *σαλπίσω* for *σαλπήξω* 1 Cor. xv. 52, cf. also 82 Mechan. vett. p. 201 (Num. x. 8; also 1st Aor. *ἐσάλπισα* for 6th ed. *ἐσάλπνυξα* Xen. An. 1, 2, 17 is frequent in Sept.), see Phryn. 191; Thom. M. p. 789.

σημαίνω. 1st Aor. *ἐσήμανα* Acts xi. 28; xxv. 27 (Judg. vii. 21; Esth. ii. 22; Plutarch, Aristid. 19; Menandri Byz. hist. pp. 308, 309, 358; Act. Thom. p. 32), which is found indeed even in Xen. Hell. 2, 1, 28, but for which in early Attic *ἐσήμηνα* was the usual form, see Bttm. I. 438; Lob. 24. Cf. under *φαίνω*.

σκέπτομαι. The Pres. (Heb. ii. 6; Jas. i. 27; cf. Ps. viii. 5; 1 Sam. xi. 8; xv. 4, etc.) and Imperf. occur but seldom in Attic, Bttm. II. 291.

* *σπουδάζω*. Fut. *σπουδάσω* for the usual *σπουδάσομαι* 2 Pet. i. 15; Bttm. II. 85.

στηρίζω. Imperat. Aor. according to good Codd. is *στήρισον* Luke xxii. 32; Rev. iii. 2, and Fut. 2 Thess. iii. 3 in B *στηρίσει*, instead of the forms preferred by Greek authors, *στήριξον* and *στηρίξει*, Bttm. I. 372; cf. Judg. xix. 5; Ezek. xx. 46, and often; also *ἐστήρισα* 1 Macc. xiv. 14, etc.

τυγχάνω. Of the Perf. we find Heb. viii. 6 in text. rec. the (properly Ionic, then Attic, Bttm. II. 301) form *τέτευχε*; but in other Codd. the usual Attic *τέτύχηκε*, and in A D [Sin.*] et al. *τέτυχε*. On the latter see Lob. 395.

φαγεῖν. Fut. *φάγομαι* Jas. v. 3; Rev. xvii. 16 [Jno. ii. 17] (Gen. xxvii. 25; Exod. xii. 8, etc.), whence 2d Per. *φάγεσαι* Luke xvii. 8. For this Greek authors use *ἔδομαι* from *ἔδω*, Bttm. II. 185.

φαίνω. 1st Aor. Inf. *ἐπιφᾶναι* (*ἐπιφῆναι*) Luke i. 79, contrary to the best usage. In later Greek, however, similar forms occur; Lob. 26; Thilo, Acta Thom. 49 sq. (Aelian, anim. 2, 11; and epil. 102 p. 396, Jac.).

φαύσκω. Hence *ἐπιφαύσει* Eph. v. 14; cf. Gen. xlv. 3; Judg. xvi. 2; 1 Sam. xiv. 36; Judith xiv. 2. As to the analogical proof of this form, not found in Greek authors, by means of the Subs. *ὑπόφανσις*, see Bttm. II. 312.

* **φέρω.** Aor. Partic. *ἐνέγκας* Acts v. 2; xiv. 13 (*ἐνέγκαντες* Luke xv. 23 var.) for *ἐνεγκών* Bttm. II. 313; yet see Xen. M. 1, 2, 53; 86 Demosth. Timoth. 703 c.; Isocr. paneg. 40. The Indic. *ἤνεγκα* 7th ed. occurs frequently in Attic, as also the Imperat. forms with *α* Jno. xxi. 10.

* **φθάνω.** According to several Atticists the 2d Aor. *ἔφθην* is to be preferred to the 1st Aor. *ἔφθασα*, which, however, often occurs even in Attic writers (Bttm. II. 316), and prevails in the N. T. Matt. xii. 28; Rom. ix. 31; 2 Cor. x. 14; Phil. iii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 16. In the last passage several Codd. have the Perf. *ἔφθακε*.

φύω. 2d Aor. Pass. *ἐφύην*, *φνείς* Luke viii. 6, 7, 8 (since Hippocrat. very much used), for which the Attics employ the 2d Aor. Act. *ἔφυν*, *φύς*; see Bttm. II. 321. In Matt. xxiv. 32 and Mark xiii. 28 very good Codd. have *ἐκφύῃ* (Aor. Pass. Subj.) for *ἐκφύη*; and the former reading may be regarded as preferable; see Fr. Marc. 578 sq.

83 **χαίρω.** Fut. *χαρήσομαι* for *χαίρήσω* Luke i. 14; Jno. xvi. 20, 6th ed. 22; Phil. i. 18 (Hab. i. 16; Zech. x. 7; Ps. xcv. 12, and often), see Moer. 120; Thom. Mag. 910; Lob. 740; Bttm. II. 322. It occurs also Diod. Exc. Vat. p. 95.

* **χαρίζομαι.** Fut. *χαρίσομαι* Rom. viii. 32 is the non-Attic form for *χαριούμαι*.

ῥέω. Aor. *ἠρώσατο* ¹ Acts vii. 27, 39 (Mic. iv. 6; Lam. ii. 7 and often, Dion. H. II. 759), for which the better writers used *ῥώσατο* with syllabic augment (Thom. M. p. 403; Pol. 2, 69, 9; 15, 31, 12). 1st Aor. Pass. *ἠρώσθην* Ps. lxxxvii. 6; cf. Xen. Hell. 4, 3, 12; Dio C. 37, 47. Also Aor. Act. *ἔῤωσεν* Acts vii. 45 for which some Codd. have *ἔῤώσεν* (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 181). That remark, however, respecting the syll. augm. holds strictly only of the Attic authors; see Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 407.

* **ὠνέομαι.** 1st Aor. *ὠνησάμην* Acts vii. 16, as frequently in writers of the *κοινή* (e.g. Plut., Pausan.), Lob. 139. In Attic *ἐπιράμην* is preferred.

Note. The later verbal forms are not always used in the N. T. where 103 they might be expected. We find for instance *πίομαι* 2d Fut. from *πίνω*,

¹ After the Fut. *ῥσω* (from *ῥθω*). The Aorist form from the other Fut. *ῥθήσω* occurs only in later authors, as e.g. the Particip. *εἰσῥήσας* in Cinnam. p. 193.

and not *πιῶμαι* Rev. xiv. 10 (see Bttm. I. 395); Abr. *κυνῶσαι* Mark vii. 15, 18 etc.; Moeris, ed. Piers. p. 434; Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 254; Fut. *φεύξομαι*, *θανμάσομαι*, and not *φεύξω*, *θανμάσω* (Bttm. II. 85). Among the various readings occurs Heb. iv. 15 *πεπειραμένον* from the older form *πειρώ* instead of *πεπειρασμένον* from *πειράζω*; the former Tdf. has received into the text.

That the same forms sometimes come by inflection from entirely different verbs is well known; we shall only specify *ἐξένευσε* Jno. v. 13, which grammatically may come equally from *ἐκνέω* (Bttm. II. 248) and from *ἐκνεύω*.

§ 16. FORMATION OF WORDS.¹

The N. T. contains a number of words never occurring in Greek 87 authors, but borrowed from the spoken language of the time, and ^{7th ed.} in part new formations (particularly in the writings of Paul). The greater the number of these peculiar forms, the more necessary it becomes to compare them with the established principles of Greek derivation (from stems). In doing this, it will be instructive to note analogies not altogether unknown to Greek authors, but 84 far more prominent in the idiom of the N. T. Our remarks will be ^{8th ed.} founded on the luminous exposition of Bttm., which comprehends whatever is of essential importance (II. § 118 ff.), cf. Krü. § 41 ff.

1. A. DERIVATION BY TERMINATIONS. a. VERBS: Of derivative verbs (mostly but not entirely from nouns) those in *ω* and *ιζω* are peculiarly frequent. Forms in *ω* partly superseded those in *ευω* or *ιζω*; as, *δεκατόω* (*δεκατεύω* Xen. An. 5, 3, 9, etc.), *ἐξουθενόω* (*ἐξουθενίζω* in Plutarch, yet see in general Lob. 182), *σαρόω* (for *σαίρω* Lob. 89), *κεφαλαίόω* (*κεφαλίζω* Lob. 95), *δυναμόω* and *ἐνδυναμόω* (Lob. 605, note), *ἀφυπνόω* (*ἀφυπνίζω* Lob. 224), 104 *ἀνακαινόω* (*ἀνακαινίζω* Isocr. Areop. c. 3), besides *μεστόω*, *δολιόω*. From *δεκατόω* comes *ἀποδεκατόω*; with *ἀφυπνόω* compare *καθυπνόω* Xen. M. 2, 1, 30. *Κραταίόω* occurs also for *κρατύνω*, *σθενόω* for *σθαιένω*, *ἀναστατοῦν* for *ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν*; but *χαριτόω* is formed from *χάρις*, *δυνατόω* from *δύναμις* (Lob. Phryn. 605).

Verbs in *ιζω* come from the most diverse stems: *ὀρθρίζω* from *ὀρθρος*, *αἰχμαλωτίζω* from *αἰχμάλωτος*, *δειγματίζω* from *δειγμα*,

¹ See Ph. Cattieri, *Gazophylacium Graecor.* (1651, 1708) ed. F. L. Abresch (Utr. 1757) L. B. 1809, 8vo., but especially Bttm. *ausf. Gr.* II. 382 ff. (with Lobeck's additions), Lobeck, *Parerga* to Phryn., and his other works referred to above, p. 3. Among expository works we must mention chiefly *Selecta e Scholis Valckenarii*. Specimens of later formations are to be found especially in the Byzantine authors.

πελακίζω from πέλεις, μυκτηρίζω from μυκτήρ, σμυρνίζω, ἀνεμίζω, φυλακίζω, ἱματίζω, ἀναθεματίζω (also in Byzantine authors), θαλατρίζω (Cinnam. p. 218), σπλαγχνίζομαι, αἰρετίζω, συμμορφίζω (Phil. iii. 10 according to good Codd.). Σκορπίζω (διασκορπίζω) has no distinct stem in the Greek literary language; it was, however, a provincial, perhaps a Macedonic, form (Lob. 218).

As to verbs in ιζω from names of nations and persons, see Bttm. II. 385. We have only to mention ἰουδαίζω, with which compare the later word δαυιδίζω, Leo Gram. p. 447.

There are also a few verbs in αζω seldom or never occurring elsewhere, e.g. νηπιάζω, σινιάζω (σήθω).

88 Also in ευω, as μεσιτεύω, μαγεύω, ἐγκρατεύομαι, αἰχμαλωτεύω
7th ed. (Lob. 442), παγιδεύω, γυμνητεύω. The last is from γυμνήτης, which, according to Bttm. II. 431, is only to be vindicated as a collateral form of γυμνής. From γυμνός, on the other hand, one would expect γυμνίτης, and accordingly the best Codd. [Sin. also] have 1 Cor. iv. 11 γυμνιτεύω, which therefore we must not, with Fr. (conform. crit. p. 21) and Mey., take for an error of the copyist.¹

Among verbs in υνω, which signify a rendering what the (concrete) root denotes (as ἱλαρύνειν, i.e. ἱλαρὸν ποιεῖν) Bttm. II. 387, σκληρύνω is to be noticed as a collateral form of σκληρόω, which never occurs in the N. T.

Verbs in αινω (λευκαίνω, ξηραίνω, εὐφραίνω Bttm. II. 65 f.; Lob. prolegg. pathol. 37) require no special remark.

The formation of verbs in θω, from primitives in εω, which is not unknown in Attic (Bttm. II. 61; Lob. 151), seems to have
85 been practised more frequently in later Greek; νήθω, κνήθω, ἀλήθω,
6th ed. are not used at least by the earlier writers. Yet cf. Lob. 254.

Verbs in σκω (except εὗρισκω and διδάσκω) are rare even in
105 the N. T. (Bttm. II. 59 f.). We find γηράσκω as an inchoative (Bttm. II. 393), but μεθύσκω, causative from μεθύω, only in the Pass. Γαμίσκω, equivalent to γαμίζω, is sufficiently attested only in Luke xx. 34. Lastly, we note as altogether singular in formation γηρηγορέω (from the Perf. ἐγηγήγορα), with its cognate ἐγηρηγορέω, Lob. 119; Bttm. II. 158. With this verb,² derived from a reduplicated Perfect, may be compared, however, ἐπικεχειρέω Papyri Taurin. 7, lin. 7.

¹ Cf. Lob. Soph. Ai. p. 387. Ὀλοσθρεύω Heb. xi. 28 is, in some good Codd., written δλεσθρεύω (from δλεσθρος), and Lchm., and with him Tdf., has so printed. I am not aware that the latter form of this Alexandrian word has been preserved anywhere else.

² Döderlein on reduplication in Greek and Latin derivation in his Reden und Aufsätze II. no. 2.

To derivative verbs in *ενω* belongs also *παραβολεύσθαι* Phil. ii. 30, (which Griesb., Lchm., and others, agreeably to the weightiest critical evidence, have admitted into the text). From *παράβολος* might have been formed most naturally *παραβολεύσθαι*; but the termination *ενω* was selected to make the verb signify *παράβολον εἶναι*, as *ἐπισκοπεῖν* in later Greek denotes *ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι* (Lob. 591), and, what is more to the purpose, there is *περπερεύσθαι* from *πέρπερος*. It would be unwarrantable to grant admission to *παραβολεύσθαι* only on the assumption of a simple verb *βολεύσθαι*, (which certainly does not occur).

2. b. SUBSTANTIVES: ¹ Derived *a. from Verbs* (cf. Lob. paralip. p. 397 sqq. and particularly lib. 3 of *technologia* p. 253 sqq.).

With the termination *μος* (Bttm. II. 398) from a verb in *αζω* is to be noted *ἀγιασμός* which does not occur in Greek authors, like *πειρασμός* from *πειράζω*, *ἐνταφιασμός* from *ἐνταφιάζω*; from verbs in *ιζω* we find *μακαρισμός*, *ὄνειδισμός* (Lob. 551), *βασανισμός*, ⁸⁹ *παροργισμός*, *ῥαντισμός* (*ῥαντίζειν*), *σαββατισμός* (*σαββατίζειν*), ^{7th ed} *σωφρονισμός*, *ἀπελεγμός*.

The most numerous formations, however, are those in *μα* (Lob. as above 391 sqq.) and *σις*, the former mostly confined to the N. T. yet always conformed to Greek analogy; as, *βάπτισμα*, *ῥάπισμα* from *βαπτίζειν* etc., *ψεῦσμα* from *ψεύδεται*, *ιεράτευμα*, *κατάλυμα* (*καταλύειν*), also *ἐξέραμα* (Lob. 64), *ἀσθήνημα*, *ἀντλημα*, *ἀντάλλαγμα*, *ἀποσκίασμα*, *πρόσκομμα*, *ἀπαίγασμα*, *ἡττημα*, *αἴτημα*, *κατόρθωμα*, *στερέωμα* from contract verbs (like *φρόνημα*, etc.), mostly in the sense of product or state. Only *ἀντλημα* denotes an implement (as substantives in *μος* often do), and *κατάλυμα* the place of *καταλύειν* (Eustath. *Odys.* p. 146, 33).

Substantives in *σις*, particularly numerous in the Epistle to the 106 Hebrews, nearly all belong to literary Greek. Only *θέλησις*, *κατάπαυσις*, *πρόσχυσις*,² *ἀπολύτρωσις*, *δικαίωσις*, *βίωσις*, *πεποιθήσις* Lob. 295 (*ἐπιπόθησις*) require notice. As to *παρασκευή*, formed from the stem of a verb in *αζω*, see Bttm. II. 404. As to *οικοδομή*, see Lob. 490. As to the very common *διαθήκη* (from 1st Aor. of ⁸⁶ *τιθέναι*), see Bttm. II. 401; Lob. paralip. 374. ^{6th ed}

Among abstract nouns from verbs are some in *μονή*. We find in the N. T. *πλησμονή* Bttm. II. 405. On the contrary, *ἐπιλησμονή* comes directly from *ἐπιλήσμων*. *Πεισμονή*, however (also in

¹ Cf. *G. Curtius*, de nomin. gr. formatione linguar. cognat. ratione habita. Berol. 1842 (*Zeitschr. f. Alterth.* 1846, no. 68 f.).

² The form *χυσις* appears to have been employed only in words compounded with other nouns. Compare the N. T. word *αἱματεχυσις* (Leo Gramm. p. 287) with *αἱματοχυσις* (Theophan. p. 510), *φωτοχυσις* and *ῥυγεχυσις*.

Pachym. II. 100 and 120), is another form of *πείσμα*, though *πεισμονή* may be referred directly to *πείθω*, as *πλησμονή* to *πλήθω*. Among abstract nouns in the N. T. derived from verbs in *εω* must be mentioned *ἐριθεία*.¹

Verbal nouns with a *concrete* signification present little that is peculiar. From verbs in *αζω, ιζω, υζω*, we find in the N. T. *κτίστης* (paroxyt.) and the oxytones (Bttm. II. 408) *βιαστής, βαπτιστής, μεριστής, εὐαγγελιστής, γογγυστής*, and *ἐλλημιστής*,² forms rare or unknown elsewhere. Only *κολλυβιστής*, (which is not peculiar however to the N. T.), cannot be traced to a verb *κολλυβίζειν*. From *τελειούν* we have *τελειωτής* (cf. *ξηλωτής* and *λυτρωτής*). From *προσκυνεῖν* comes *προσκυνητής* (Constant. Man. 4670). On *ἐπενδύτης* see Bttm. II. 411. The earlier writers prefer *διωκτῆρ* to *διώκτης*; just as *δότης* appears as a secondary form by the side of *δοτήρ*.

Very strange would be the formation of *κατάνυξις* from *κατανυστάζω* Rom. xi. 8 (from Sept.) as was formerly supposed. But its connection with *κατανύσσειν* is evident from Dan. x. 9, Theod., and thus it very probably denotes *stupefaction* (תִּשְׁתַּחֲשֹׁחַ Ps. lx. 5), and thence *torpor*; see Fr. Excur. Rom. II. 558 sqq.

107 From careless pronunciation arose the form *ταμείον*, as all good Codd. have Luke xii. 24 and many Codd. have Matt. vi. 6, for *ταμείον* (from *ταμεύω*) see Lob. Phryn. 493 and paralip. 28, and the compound *γλωσσόκομον* for *γλωσσοκομείον* or *γλωσσοκόμιον* (from *κομέω*) without var., see Lob. 98 sq.

β. *From Adjectives.* Under this head come,

Various abstract nouns in *της, οτης*, as *ἀγιότης, ἀγνότης, ἀδελφότης* (Leo Gramm. p. 464), *ἀδρότης, ἀπλότης, ἰκανότης, ἀφελότης* (*ἀφέλεια* in earlier authors), *σκληρότης, τιμιότης, τελειότης, ματαιότης, γυμνότης, μεγαλειότης, κυριότης, αἰσχροότης, πτώτης* (*ἀγαθότης* Sept.), see Lob. 350 sqq. (*ἀκαθάρτης* Rev. xvii. 4 is not well attested);

¹ The connection of *ἐριθεία* with *ἐρις* is not prevented by the *θ* alone (for that occurs in the cognates *ἐρέθειν, ἐρεθίζειν*), but its whole structure is such that it can only be referred to *ἐριθύνω*. But Fr. Rom. I. 143 sqq. has satisfactorily shown that *ἐριθεία* even in the N. T. is nothing else than the *ἐριθεία, labor for wages*, already known to the Greeks. Among earlier writers see *Stolberg*, de soloc. N. T. p. 136 sqq.

² *Ἑλληνίζειν* signifies in general to *comport one's self as a Greek* (Diog. L. I. 102), and most usually to *speak Greek*, especially of foreigners, Strabo 14, 662; then often it has no unfavorable secondary meaning, (erroneously *de Wette*, Bibel, reprinted from the Hall. Encycl. S. 17), Xen. A. 7, 3, 25; Strabo 2, 98. *Ἑλλημιστής*, therefore, — a substantive which never occurs in Greek authors, — means very naturally a *Greek-speaking non-Greek* (e.g. a Jew). That in Christian Greek phraseology *ἑλληνίζειν* also signifies to be a *heathen* (e.g. in Malalas p. 449) is a fact lying beyond our present inquiry.

And such substantives in *συνη* (denoting mental qualities) as *ἐλεημοσύνη* and *ἀσχημοσύνη* (from *ἐλεήμων* and *ἀσχήμων*, cf. *σωφροσύνη* from *σώφρων*), or *ἡγασύνη*, *ἀγαθωσύνη*, *ἱερωσύνη*, *μεγαλωσύνη*, with *ω*, because the penult of the adjectives is short (Etym. M. p. 275, 44)¹ — all later words found only in Hellenistic writers; cf. in general Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 235 sqq. 87
6th ed.

Also among those in *ια* which come from adjectives in *ος*, *ρος* (Bttm. II. 415) are many later formations (Lob. 343); as, *ἐλαφρία* (like *αἰσχρία* in Eustath. from *αἰσχρός*); and as *εὐδαιμονία* from *εὐδαίμων*, so 2 Pet. ii. 16 *παραφρονία* from *παράφρων* (Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 238); some Codd., however, have the more usual *παραφροσύνη*.²

Lastly, we often find Neuters of adjectives in *ως* used as substantives; as, *ὑποζύγιον*, *μεθόριον*, *ὑπολήνιον*, *σφάγιον* (*προςσφάγιον*), etc., see Fr. Prälimin. S. 42.

γ. From other Substantives (Bttm. II. 420 ff.) are derived *εἰδωλεῖον* (*εἰδωλον*), *ἐλαιών* (*ἐλαία*), *μυλών* Matt. xxiv. 41 var. (*μύλος*, *μύλη*) Bttm. II. 422 f. and the Fem. *βασίλισσα* (Bttm. II. 427). *Ἀφεδρών*, peculiar to the N.T., comes from *ἔδρα*. The Gentile Fem. from *Φοίνιξ* is *Φοίνισσα*; therefore also Mark vii. 26 *Συρο-φοίνισσα*, as from *Κίλιξ* comes *Κίλισσα* (Bttm. II. 427). Perhaps, however, the Fem. was also formed from the name of the country *Φοινίκη*; for, a large number of good Codd. [Sin. also] have in the above passage in Mark *Συροφοινίκισσα*, cf. Fritzsche, and this might come directly from an original form *Φοινικίς*, as *βασίλισσα* is connected with *βασιλῆς*, and, at least among the Romans, Scythissa occurs for *Σκυθίς*, or in later Greek *φυλάκισσα* by the side of *φυλακίς*. See in general Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 413 sqq. 91
7th ed.

To the later and Latinizing formation belong, of Gentile and Patronymic nouns, *Ἡρωδιανός* Matt. xxii. 16 and *Χριστιανός* Acts xi. 26, etc. (cf. *Καίσαριανός* Arrian. Epict. 1, 19, 19; 3, 24, 117). In the earlier language, the termination *ανος* was employed only in forming Gentile names from cities and countries not Greek; Bttm. II. 429.

¹ Yet in Glycas, p. 11, even in the later edition, *μεγαλοσύνη* is printed. Bttm. II. 420, shows that nearly all substantives in *ωσύνη* belong to the later language. On the termination *συνη* in general, see *Aufrecht* in the Berl. Zeitschr. f. vergleich. Sprachforsch. 6 Heft; [and on the termination *της* G. Bühler, das griech. Secundärsuffix *της*. Ein Beitrag z. Lehre v. d. Wortbildung. Gött. 1858. 8vo.]

² Of substantives derived from adjectives in *ης*, some, as is well known, end in *ια* instead of *εια* (Bttm. II. 416). In others, the spelling varies between *ια* and *εια*, as in *κακοπαθία* (cf. Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 154. Ellendt, praef. ad Arrian. p. 30 sqq. Weber, Demosth. p. 511). In regard to this word, however, the preponderance is for *εια*.

Among Diminutives deserves to be mentioned βιβλαρίδιον, primarily from βιβλάριον, quoted by Pollux, instead of the older forms βιβλίδιον and βιβλιδάριον (like ἱματιδάριον from ἱματίδιον), Lob. pathol. 281. Γυναικάριον follows the usual analogy, but seems to have been of rare occurrence in Greek authors; the same may be said of ᾠτάριον Mark xiv. 47; Jno. xviii. 10, κλινάριον, παιδάριον. On diminutives in ἰον (of which ψυχίον is unquestionably a later form), see Fr. Prälim. S. 43, and a dissertation De vocib. in ἰον trisyllabis by Janson in Jahn's Archiv VII. 485 ff.

Substantives in ῥιον are properly Neuters of adjectives (Bttm. II. 412 f.); as, ἰλαστήριον, θυματήριον, φυλακτήριον. (Such become still more numerous in later writers, e.g. ἀνακαλυπτήριον Niceph. Gregor. p. 667, δεητήριον 88 Cedren. II. 377, θανατήριον ibid. I. 679, ἱαματήριον I. 190, etc.) Φυλα- 6th ed. κτήριος, directly from φυλακτήρ, has like it an active meaning — *guarding, protecting*. Ἰλαστήριον properly signifies *something that propitiates*, but may be applied to the place where the propitiation is accomplished (just as φυλακτήριον denotes a *guard-post*), and consequently to the cover of the ark of the covenant. In Rom. iii. 25 the signification *propitiatory offering* (Index to Theoph. contin.) is equally appropriate, which Philippi without sufficient reason has recently denied. A Fem. subst. of the same sort is ζευκτηρία (cf. στυπτηρία). Σωτηρία is connected immediately with σωτήρ; side by side with it occurs σωτήριον also as a substantive. Ὑπερφόν, that is ὑπερώϊον, is to be regarded in like manner as a Neuter from ὑπερώϊος, which, like πατρώος from πατήρ, is formed from the preposition ὑπέρ, for there is no intermediate adjective ὑπερός.

- 109 3. c. ADJECTIVES: a. To adjectives derived directly from a *verbal* root belongs the fully established πειθός 1 Cor. ii. 4; cf. ἐδός from ἔδω, βοσκός from βόσκω, φειδός from (φείδω) φειδομαι (Lob. Phryn. p. 434). These derivatives are all oxytones, φάγος alone occurring in the grammarians as also a paroxytone (Lob. paralip. 135), and it is written as such in the N. T.

Among those in ῶλος, ἁμαρτωλός is the most frequent (Bttm. II. 448). To be referred to the same formation, however, is εἰδῶλον

- 92 Neut. from εἰδῶλος (Lob. pathol. p. 134).

7th ed. Verbals in τος (Bttm. I. 443 ff.; Lob. paralip. 478 sq.; Moissistzig, de adj. graec. verbal. Conitz 1844, 4to.) correspond in signification, sometimes to the Latin participle in *tus*, as γνωστός *notus*, σιτευτός *saginat*, ἀπαίδευτος (*untrained, awkward*) cf. θεόπνευστος *inspiratus*¹; sometimes to adjectives in *bilis*, as ὁρατός,

¹ That this word in 2 Tim. iii. 16 is to be taken in a passive sense, there can be no doubt; this acceptance is confirmed by ἑμπνευστος, though several derivatives of the same class have an active signification, as εὐπνευστος, ἔπνευστος.

δυσβάστακτος, ἀνεκτός, ἀκατάσχετος, ἀκαταπανστός, ἀνεκδιύγητος, ἀνεκλάλητος; sometimes they have an active meaning (Fr. Rom. II. 185), as ἄπταιστος *not stumbling*, i.e. *not sinning* (certainly, however, not ἀλάλητος Rom. viii. 26).

Ἀπειράστος (like the ἀπείρατος usual in Greek authors) means either *untempted*, or *that cannot be tempted*; both amount to the same thing in Jas. i. 13. Only παθητός Acts xxvi. 23, signifies *who is to suffer*; cf. φευκτός, πρακτός Aristot. de anima 3, 9, p. 64 Sylb.; Cattier, gazophyl. p. 34. The verbal προσήλυτος, akin to the forms ἔπηλυς, μέτηλυς, is an extended formation of which no example is to be found in classic Greek.

β. Among adjectives derived from *other adjectives* (or participles) a few are deserving of special notice. Such are περιούσιος, ἐπιούσιος, like ἐκούσιος, ἐθελούσιος (Lob. Phryn. p. 4 sq.), which are extended formations from ἐκών and ἐθέλων like the feminines ἐκούσα, ἐθελούσα; but ἐπιούσιος [according to Leo Meyer, in Kuhn's Ztschr. für vergleichende Sprachforschung. Bd. VII. Berl. 1858. pp. 424 sq. 428, formed by means of the suffix *ω* from ἐπί and ὄντ, and that denoting "what is ἐπί," so that ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος signifies "bread that is serviceable, or suited, or necessary for life, for subsistence, that which answers our needs, is adequate for them"] has probably direct relation to the Fem. (ῆ) ἐπιούσα sc. ἡμέρα, and accordingly ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος means *bread for the following day*, cf. Stolberg, diss. de pane ἐπιουσίῳ in his tractat. de soloecism. N. T. p. 220 sqq.; Valcken. Select. I. 190; Fr. ad Mt. p. 267 sq. (also against the derivation from οὐσία, which would be grammatically 89 possible, cf. ἐνούσιος). Besides, περιούσιος in the Bible does not mean simply *proprius*, in opposition to what belongs to a stranger, any more than περιουσιασμός in the Sept. means *property* merely.

Πιστικός (Mark xiv. 3; Jno. xii. 3) from πιστός, according to 110 several ancient expositors equivalent to *genuine*. In classic authors the word signifies *convincing*, probably also *persuasive* (Plat. Gorg. 455 a.; Diog. L. 4, 37; Dion. H. V. 631; Sext. Emp. Math. 2, 71; Theophrast. metaph. 253 Sylb.), though in nearly all the passages Codd. have πειστικός, and critics have usually given this the preference (see Bekker and Stallb. on Plato, as above; cf. Lob. Soph. Ai. v. 151); in later writers *faithful*, *trustworthy*, of persons (Lücke, Joh. II. 496; see Index to Cedren. p. 950). The tran- 98 sition to the signification *genuine* as the predicate of a material 7th ed. object, is not impossible, particularly when it is considered that technical expressions (such as νάρδος πιστική may be), and espec-

ially mercantile terms, are often strange.¹ Others, after Casaubon, take πιστικός for *drinkable* (Fr. Mr. 598 sqq.) from πιπίσκω or the root πῖω, like πιστός *drinkable* Aeschyl. Prom. 480, πιστήρ, πίστρα, πίστρον, etc., quoted in old Lexicons. That the ancients drank oil of spikenard, we are told by Athenæus 15, 689. I cannot, however, quite understand why both Evangelists subjoined *this* epithet; if the thin, liquid nard used for pouring out (Mark καταχέειν) in no respect differed from what was drunk, it would have been just as superfluous to add the epithet πιστ. as to call nard *fluid*. The νάρδος λεπτή of Dioscorides, however, means *fluid* nard, as opposed to *thick, viscid* nard. Besides, the *drinkable* nard would not be suited to the manipulation indicated by ἀλείφειν in John. Lastly, Fritzsche's translation of πιστ. (ad Mr. p. 601), "qui facile bibi potest, lubenter bibitur," does not appear to be sufficiently established, not to mention that πιστικός cannot be positively shown to have signified *drinkable*. Even πιστός itself was not much in use (in Aeschyl. it occurs in a pun), and was superseded by the unambiguous ποτός, πόσιμος.

γ. To adjectives derived from *substantives* belong, among others, σάρκινος and σαρκικός. The former means *fleshy* 2 Cor. iii. 3 (as pro-paroxytone adjectives in *ινος* almost without exception denote the material of which a thing is made, e.g. λίθινος of *stone* 2 Cor. iii. 3, ξύλινος *wooden*, πήλινος of *clay*, ἀκάνθινος, βύσσινος, etc., Bttm. II. 448), the latter (σαρκικός) means *fleshy*. There is, however, in Rom. vii. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 1 (2 Cor. i. 12); Heb. vii. 16, where one might have expected σαρκικός, preponderating or respectable authority for σάρκινος, and even Lchm. has placed it in the text. But how easily might σαρκικός, which does not occur outside of the N. T., be confounded in the Codd. with the very common σάρκινος (Fr. Rom. II. 46 sq.)! Had Paul, however, written σάρκινος, he must have intended some peculiar emphasis, somewhat in the way that Mey., 1 Cor. as above, insists upon. But on the one hand, a notion of the natural man for which only the material term σάρκινος would be adequate finds no sanction in the doctrinal teaching of Paul, while σαρκικός, as opposed to πνευματικός, fully meets the demands even of the text in question; and on the other

¹ They have in particular this peculiarity, that words elsewhere used only of persons are transferred to articles of merchandise. Compare *flat*, properly equivalent to feeble, and the expressions, "Sugar dull — white unasked for." Lob. paralip. 31 upholds Scaliger's derivation from πτίσσω (Fr. Mr. p. 595), as τ after π elsewhere also for euphony's sake is thrown away (cf. πτέρνιξ, πέρνιξ, but particularly πίτυρον and the Latin *pinus*). Mey. has not been induced to abandon the interpretation *genuine*.

hand, 1 Cor. iii. 3, taken in connection with 2, shows that in both passages Paul employed the same expression. In the passage from Heb. (vii. 16) *ἐντολή σαρκίνη* is hardly admissible.¹

Among oxytone adjectives in *ινος*, expressing a notion of *time* (Bttm. II. 448), are *καθημερινός*, *ὀρθρινός*, *πρωϊνός*, later forms for which earlier authors used *καθημέριος*, etc. The like holds true of *ταχινός*.

Some adjectives derived from substantives end in *εινός*; as, *σκοτεινός*, *φωτεινός*. But *ἐλσεινός* (a form not unfrequent in Attic also V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 456) comes from the verb *ἐλσέω*, as *ποθεινός* from *ποθέω* (Bttm. II. 448).

To the later adjectival formations specially belongs *κεραμικός* (*κεράμειος*, *κεράμιος*).

Among adverbs derived from verbs *φειδομένως* seems to be peculiar to the N. T.

4. B. DERIVATION BY COMPOSITION. a. The N. T. contains numerous compound substantives whose *first part* also is a *substantive*. Although many of these compounds, however, cannot be shown to have existed in the written language of the Greeks, yet in their formation there is nothing noticeably at variance with analogy. Compare in particular *δικαιοκρισία* (Leo Gr. p. 163), *αἱματεκχυσία*, *ταπεινόφρων* (like *εὐσεβόφρων*, *κραταιόφρων* Constant. Porphy. II. 33, by later authors even *ιουδαϊόφρων*, *ἐλληνόφρων* Cedren. I. 660; Theoph. I. 149) and *ταπεινοφροσύνη* (cf. *ματαιοφροσύνη* Constant. Man. 657), *σκληροκαρδία*, *σκληροτράχηλος* (from which we find *σκληροτραχηλία* and *σκληροτραχηλιᾶν* in Constant. Man.), *ἀκροβυστία*,² *ἀκρογωνιαίος*, *ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος* (cf. *ἄλλο-*

¹ It might perhaps be assumed in general that the later popular Greek interchanged these forms, and used *σάρκινος* also in the sense of *σαρκινός*: especially as not all adjectives in *ινος* signify the material of which a thing is made, cf. *ἄνθρωπινος* (see Fr. Rom. II. 47; Thöluck, Hebr.-Br. 301 f.). Somewhat similar in German is the expression das *Inwendige* of man for das *Innere*. The former had originally a more restricted meaning. Since, however, the term *σαρκινός* had already established itself undeniably in the language of the N. T., the above assumption loses here all foundation.

² Wenn dieses Wort anders von *βύω*, *βύω* mit Etymol. m. abzuleiten ist, was neuerlich Fr. Rom. I. 136 bestritten hat, theils weil *βύω* nicht scheine *tegere* geheissen zu haben (wie bei dieser Etymologie angenommen wird), theils weil das Wort nicht bestimmt das Glied bezeichne, dessen Extremität bedeckt sei, also nicht verstanden worden sein würde. Jener erste Grund scheint mir durchgreifender als der zweite. Ich möchte aber glauben, dass *ἀκροβυστία* nicht eine absichtslose Umbildung des griech. *ἀκροποσθία*, sondern gefässentliche Umgestaltung sei, welche aus Schaam die Sache verdeckt ausdrücken sollte: *ἀκρόβυστος* vorn (an der Spitze) strahlend von Unbeschnittenen im Gegensatz der Beschnittenen, deren vorderes Schaamglied glatt und straff war. Es ist

- 91 τριοπραγμοσύνη Plato, rep. 4, 444 b.), ἀνθρωπάρεσκος (Lob. 621),
 6th ed. ποταμοφόρητος (cf. ὑδατοφόρητος Const. Man. 409), καρδιογνώστης
 112 (καρδιόπληκτος Theoph. I. 736, καρδιοκολάπτης Leo Gr. 441),
 σητόβρωτος, ὀφθαλμοδουλεία, εἰδωλολάτρης,¹ εἰδωλόθυτον (Cedren.
 95 I. 286, cf. the abstract εἰδωλοθυσία Theophan. 415), δεσμοφύλαξ
 7th ed. (νωτοφύλαξ Theophan. I. 608), ὀρκωμοσία (cf. ἀπωμοσία, κατωμο-
 σία), πατροπαράδοτος (θεοπαράδοτος Theophan. I. 627), ἰσάγγελος
 (Theoph. I. 16), εὐπερίστατος, πολυποίκιλος, the Adverb παμπληθεῖ
 (the Adj. παμπληθής is found in good authors), εἰλικρινής, εἰλι-
 κρίνεια (Fuhr, Dicaearch. p. 198).

To the compound δευτερόπρωτος in Luke vi. 1 (?) comes nearest δευτεροδεκάτη found in Jerome on Ezek. c. 45. As the latter means *second-tenth*, so the former *second-first*.

Δωδεκάφυλος, the Neut. of which is used as a noun in Acts xxvi. 7, is sustained by τετράφυλος Her. 5, 66.

More rarely is the first part of the compound a *verb*, as in ἐθελοθρησκεία *self-chosen worship*; cf. ἐθελοδουλία.

Compound adjectives whose first part is a privative exhibit nothing anomalous, though perhaps many of them were not current in written Greek (ἀμετανόητος, ἀνεξερεύνητος, ἀνεξιχνίαστος); only ἀνέλεος Jas. ii. 13, which Lehm. on the authority of good Codd. [Sin. also] has received into the text instead of ἀνίλεως, is singular, as the Greeks used ἀνηλεής, or at least ἀνελεής (Lob. 710). Ἀνέλεος would be formed like ἀνελπισ, ἄπαις, and may have been intended as a verbal antithesis to ἔλεος. Even Bttm. II. 467 considered the α of the verb ἀτενίζω, derived from the Adj. ἀτενής, to be the so-called α intensive; but it is better to take it, with Lob. pathol. I. 35, for α formative. See besides Döderlein, de ἀλφα intensivo sermonis graeci, Erl. 1830, 4to.

b. When the last part of the compound is a verb — in compound verbs therefore — the verbal stem is regularly found unaltered only in combination with the so-called old prepositions (Scaliger in Lob. Phryn. 266; Bttm. II. 469 f.); in other cases with a change so far forth as the verb strictly speaking first adopts its ending from a noun formed out of the stem, as ἀδυνατεῖν, ὁμολογεῖσθαι, νουθετεῖν, εὐεργετεῖν, τροποφορεῖν, ὀρθοτομεῖν (cf. ὀρθοτομία

so in der Art euphemistischer Ausdrücke, dass sie allgemein gehalten werden; die, unter welchen sie gangbar werden, verständigen sich bald über ihren Sinn.

¹ Cf. ἀνθρωπολάτρης Ephraem. p. 743, πυρσολάτρης Pachym. 134; Geo. Pisid. Heracl. 1, 14, 182, ψευδολάτρης Theodos. acroas. 2, 73, likewise χριστολάτρης frequent in Byzantine authors.

Theophan. cont. p. 812), ἀγαθοεργεῖν and ἀγαθουργεῖν,¹ μετριοπαθεῖν, etc.

This rule, however, has some undoubted exceptions; Scaliger 113 long ago pointed out *δυσθνήσκω* in Eurip. (cf. Bttm. II. 472). *Εὐδοκεῖν*, therefore, is directly formed from *δοκεῖν*, and not, as Passow maintained, from an intermediate noun *δόκος* (Fr. Rom. II. 370); it arose simply from a combination of the words in speaking; cf. Bttm. II. 470. The same remark applies to *καταδοκεῖν* (not to be referred to *δοκεῖν*, Fritzsche. opusc. p. 151); no noun 92 *καταδόκος* exists. Even *ὁμείρεσθαι*, which in 1 Thess. ii. 8 the 6th ed. better Codd. [Sin. also] have instead of *ἰμείρεσθαι*, might be admissible, were it to be derived from *ὁμοῦ*, *ὁμός* and *εἶρειν* (Fr. Mr. p. 792). To be sure, no verb of the kind with *ὁμ.* is to be found 96 elsewhere; for *ὁμαδέω* comes from *ὁμαδος*; and *ὁμοδρομεῖν*, *ὁμοδο-* 7th ed. *ξεῖν*, *ὁμειννετεῖν*, *ὁμηρεῖν*, *ὁμοζυγεῖν*, *ὁμιλεῖν*, even *ὁμονοεῖν* (Bttm. II. 473), are likewise derived from nouns. Besides, the Genitive, governed as above by the verb, would be strange (cf. Mtth. II. 907). Perhaps, however, the first objection should not be pressed in the case of a word formed in the language of the people. If *μείρεσθαι*, which occurs in Nicand. Ther. 400 for *ἰμείρεσθαι*, were the original form, *μείρεσθαι* and *ὁμείρεσθαι* might exist side by side as well as *δύρεσθαι* and *ὀδύρεσθαι*; indeed *ὁμείρεσθαι* is perhaps the true reading (Lob. Pathol. 72).

A formation peculiar to the Hellenistic idiom is *προσωποληπτεῖν* (*προσωπολήπτης*, *προσωποληψία* Theodos. acroas. 1, 32, *ἀπροσωπολήπτως*, Acta apocr. p. 86). A corresponding verb is *ἀκαταληπτεῖν* in Sext. Emp. I. 201; for the concrete derivative, however, compare *δωρολήπτης* and *ἐργολήπτης* in the Sept.; and for the abstract *προσωποληψία*, cf. *ἐρωτοληψία* Ephraem. pp. 3104, 7890; Nicet. Eugen. 4, 251.

Many other compound *nouns* of this sort, in which, as in *προσωπολήπτης*, *θανατηφόρος*,² the second part is derived from a verb while the first denotes the object, etc. (Bttm. II. 478), occur in the N. T. but are unknown to the Greeks: e.g. *δεξιολάβος* *he who takes position at one's right*, hence an attendant.

From such compounds arise in turn, not only abstract nouns (*σκηνοπηγία* even, belongs to this class, as though from *σκηνοπηγός*,

¹ On these forms see Bttm. II. 457. Against *οικουργεῖν* and *οικουργός* (Tit. ii. 5 var.) cf. Fr. de crit. conform. p. 29.

² Also *αἰθέδης* is a compound of this description, from *αἰτός* and *ἔδειν*, *ἔδεσθαι* Bttm. II. 458.

according to numerous analogies, as *κλινοπηγία*), but also verbs: *λιθοβολεῖν* from *λιθοβόλος* (cf. *ἀνθοβολεῖν*, *θηροβολεῖν*, *ἡλιοβο-*
 114 *λεῖσθαι*, etc.), *ὀρθοποδεῖν* from *ὀρθόπους*, *δεξιολαβεῖν* Leo Gram.
 p. 175 (Bttm. II. 479).

In decomposite verbs, the preposition which constitutes the double composition is naturally put first, as *ἀπεκδέχεσθαι*, *συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι*. *Διαπαρατριβή* in 1 Tim. vi. 5 would violate this rule, if it must mean *misplaced diligence* or *unprofitable disputing*. For *this* word can only signify *continued* (endless) *hostilities, collisions*; *παραδιατριβή* would be required to express the former meaning. The majority of the Codd., however, [Sin. also] have *διαπαρατριβή* and this Lchm. has printed. A transposition of the prepositions is accordingly assumed (even by Fr. Mr. p. 796). Yet *διαπαρατριβή* *continued dissension*, is not unsuited to the passage. The other compounds beginning with *διαπαρα* which occur, viz. 1 Kings vi. 4 *διαπαράκλινεσθαι*, and 2 Sam. iii. 30 *διαπαρατρεῖν*, would be regular according to their respective import, if no doubt existed regarding the former;
 93 see Schleusner, thes. philol. sub voc. The double compound *παρακαταθήκη*
 6th ed. and the compound *παράθηκη* are equivalent in meaning (Lennep ad Phalar. ep. p. 198, Lips.; Lob. 312). The latter, however, is better established
 97 in the N. T. The Codd. exhibit variations of both forms even in Thuc.
 7th ed. 2, 72 (see the commentators), and in Plutarch. ser. vind. see Wyttenb. II. 530. Cf. besides Heinichen, ind. ad Euseb. III. 529.

Many verbs, compound as well as decompound, are found in Biblical Greek which do not occur in the classic language. In particular, verbs which the older writers used as simple, appear strengthened with prepositions which exhibit as it were to the senses the mode of the action (for the later language loves, in general, what is graphic and expressive); e.g. *καταλιθάξαι* to stone *down* to death, *ἐξορκίζειν* to get a declaration on oath *out of* one, *ἐξαστράπτειν* to flash *forth*, *ἐκγαμίζειν* to give away (*out of* the family) in marriage (*elocare*), *διεγείρειν*, *ἐξαντέλλειν*, *ἐξομολογεῖν*, and many others; see my five Progr. de verborum cum praeposit. compositor. in N. T. usu. Lips. 1834-43, 4to.

In the same way, and for the same reason, compound and double compound adverbs (prepositions) were used in later Greek; as, *ἐπάνω*, *κατενώπιον*, *κατέναντι*. In Byzantine authors such formations are carried to a greater extent than in Biblical Greek; cf. e.g. *κατεπάνω* in Constantin. Porphyrogen.

Note 1. Proper names, particularly such as are compounds, frequently appear in the N. T. in those contracted forms which are peculiar to the language of the people, and which are in part very bold (Lob. 434, cf. Schmid on Horat. epp. 1, 7, 55); as, *Ἀπολλῶς* for *Ἀπολλώνιος*, *Ἀρτεμᾶς* for *Ἀρτεμίδωρος* Tit. iii. 12, *Νυμφᾶς* for *Νυμφόδορος* Col. iv. 15,¹ *Ζηνᾶς* for

¹ *Keil* in the *Philologus* II. 468 expressed his conviction that he had found this name in an inscription in *Böckh*.

Ζηνόδωρος Tit. iii. 13, Παρμενᾶς for Παρμενίδης Acts vi. 5, Δημᾶς probably 115
 for Δημέας, Δημήτριος or Δήμαρχος Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 10, probably
 also Ὀλυμπᾶς for Ὀλυμπιόδωρος Rom. xvi. 15, Ἐπαφρᾶς for Ἐπαφρόδιτος
 Col. i. 7; iv. 12, and Ἐρμᾶς for Ἐρμόδωρος Rom. xvi. 14, Θεῶδᾶς for Θεόδωρος
 i.e. Θεόδωρος, and Λουκᾶς for *Lucanus* (in Greek authors cf. Ἀλεξᾶς for
 Ἀλέξανδρος Jos. bell. 6, 1, 8, Μηνᾶς for Μηνόδωρος, Πυθᾶς for Πυθόδωρος,
 Μετρᾶς Euseb. H. E. 6, 41). Many also in as not circumflexed appear
 to be abbreviated; as, Ἀμπλῖας for *Ampliatius* Rom. xvi. 8, Ἀντίπας for
 Ἀντίπατρος Rev. ii. 13, Κλεόπας for Κλεόπατρος Luke xxiv. 18, perhaps
 Σῶλας for Σιλουανός; see Heumann, Poecile III. 314. Σώπατρος for Σωσί-
 πατρος Acts xx. 4 (which even some Codd. give) would be likewise a very
 violent contraction, though nearer the beginning. Σώπατρος, however,
 may be an original form. On the other hand, proper names in λαος, which
 probably not (Mtth. I. 149) the Dorians alone contracted into λας, occur
 in the N. T. uncontracted: Νικόλαος, Ἀρχέλαος. Moreover, how even the
 earlier Greeks contracted names of persons for the sake of euphony,
 K. Keil has shown by examples in his spec. onomatolog. gr. (L. 1840, 8vo.)
 p. 52 sqq. The German affords examples of similar abbreviations and
 contractions in great numbers, some very forced, as Klaus from Nikolaus,
 Käthe (Kathi) from Katharina; many of them have become independent
 names which even occur in literature, as Fritz (Friedrich), Heinz (Hein-
 rich), Hans, Max. Cf. Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 504 sqq. In general, 94
 however, on Greek names of persons see Sturz, Progr. de nominib. Graecor., 6th ed.
 also in his Opusc. (Lips. 1825, 8vo.), W. Pape, Wörterb. der griech. Eigen- 98
 namen. Brschw. 1842, 8vo. (Hall. L. Z. 1843. No. 106-108), and the 7th ed.
 Beiträge zur Onomatologie by Keil in Schneidewin, Philologus, vols. 2
 and 3.

Note 2. Latin words adopted into the Greek of the N. T., — mostly sub-
 stantives denoting Roman judicial institutions, coins, or articles of dress, —
 exhibit nothing peculiar with regard to form. Latin verbs made to assume
 Greek forms make their first appearance later, in the Greek style of the
 Pseudepigrapha, the Byzantines, etc. See Thilo, Acta App. Petri et Pauli,
 Hal. 1837, 4to. L. p. 10 sq.

PART III.

SYNTAX.

A. IMPORT AND USE OF THE SEVERAL PARTS OF SPEECH

CHAPTER I.

OF THE ARTICLE.¹

§ 17. THE ARTICLE AS A PRONOUN.

1. The article δ , η , $\tau\acute{o}$ was originally a demonstrative pronoun, and is regularly employed as such in epic poetry,—to which belongs the quotation from Aratus in Acts xvii. 28: *τοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμὲν*; cf. Soph. Oed. R. 1082 *τῆς γὰρ πέφυκα μητρὸς* (Mtth. 737. For prose cf. Athen. 2, p. 37).

In prose on the other hand the article is ordinarily equivalent to a demonstrative pronoun only—

a. In the current formulas δ μὲν . . . δ δέ, οἱ μὲν . . . οἱ δέ,² sometimes in reference to a subject previously mentioned: *this . . . that, the one . . . the other* Acts xiv. 4; xvii. 32; xxviii. 24; Heb. vii. 20 f.; Gal. iv. 23 (Schæf. Dion. 421), sometimes partitively without such reference, Eph. iv. 11 *ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφῆτας, τοὺς δέ, etc. (some . . . others).*

b. In the course of narration, in the simple phrase δ δέ, οἱ δέ, 100 *but he, etc.* (as opposed to some other subject); as, Matt. xiii. 29 7th ed. δ δὲ ἔφη, ii. 9 *οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐπορεύθησαν*, ii. 14; ix. 31; Luke

¹ A. Kluit, vindiciae artic. in N. T. Traj. et Alcm. 1768-1771. P. I. Tom. I.-III., P. II. Tom. I. II. 8vo. (the book itself is written in Dutch), T. F. Middleton, the doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the criticism and illustration of the New Test. Lond. 1808, 8vo.; cf. *Schulthess* in the theol. Annal. 1808, S. 56 ff. E. Valpy, a short treatise on the doctrine of the Greek Article, according to Middleton, etc., briefly and compendiously explained as applicable to the criticism of the N. T., prefixed to his Greek Testament with English notes. Lond. 3rd ed. 1834, 3 Vols. 8vo. Emmerling's remarks on the Article in the N. T. in Keil and Tzschirner's Analekt. I. II. 147 ff. are unimportant. On the other hand, Bengel Matt. xviii. 17 discusses the subject briefly but to the purpose.

² On the accentuation see *Hm.* Vig. p. 700. On the other side, *Κρύγ.* p. 83.

iii. 13; viii. 21; xx. 12; Jno. i. 39; ix. 38; Acts i. 6; ix. 40, etc. 117 (Xen. A. 2, 3, 2; Aesch. dial. 3, 15, 17; Philostr. Ap. 1, 21, 5; Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 26, 29 etc.)

For *οἱ μὲν . . . οἱ δέ* are found also *οἱ μὲν . . . ἄλλοι δέ* Jno. vii. 12, *οἱ μὲν* 96 . . . *ἄλλοι δέ . . . ἕτεροι δέ* Matt. xvi. 14 (Plato, legg. 2, 658 b.; Ael. 2, 34; 6th ed. Palaeph. 6, 5), *τινὲς . . . οἱ δέ* Acts xvii. 18, cf. Plato, legg. 1, 627 a. and Ast on the passage. Similar expressions are still more diversified in Greek authors (Mth. 742).

Instead of the Article, the Relative also is employed in such antithetical statements; as, 1 Cor. xi. 21 *ὃς μὲν πυνῶ, ὃς δὲ μεθίει*, Matt. xxi. 35 *ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν*, etc., Acts xxvii. 44; Rom. ix. 21; Mark xii. 5; cf. Polyb. 1, 7, 3; 3, 76 4; Thuc. 3, 66; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 109 sqq.; Hm. Vig. 706. Once *ὃς μὲν . . . ἄλλος δέ* 1 Cor. xii. 8 (Xen. A. 3, 1, 35); *ὃ μὲν* (Neut.) . . . *καὶ ἕτερον* Luke viii. 5 ff.; in 1 Cor. xii. 28 an anacoluthon is easily perceived. See in general Bhdy. 306 f. (In Rom. xiv. 2 *ὃ δέ* is not related to *ὃς μὲν*, but *ὃ* is the Article belonging to *ἀσθενῶν*.)

2. In Matt. xxvi. 67; xxviii. 17 *οἱ δέ* is used of a second party without a first's having been designated by *οἱ μὲν*. The former passage *ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ ἐρράπισαν* would more regularly run thus: *καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκολάφ.*; but as he writes *ἐκολάφ.* the author has no second distributive clause definitely in mind as yet; but when he subjoins *οἱ δὲ ἐρρ.* it becomes self-evident that *ἐκολάφ.* applies to a part only of the actors; cf. Xen. H. 1, 2, 14 *οἱ αἰχμάλωτοι . . . ὄχοντο ἐς Δεκέλειαν, οἱ δ' ἐς Μέγαρα*, Cyr. 3, 2, 12; see Poppo ad. Cyr. p. 292; Bremi, Demosth. p. 273. So, in Matt. xxviii., it is first stated in general terms *οἱ ἑνδεκα μαθηταὶ . . . ἰδόντες αὐτόν προσεκύνησαν*; that this, however, is to be understood only of the greater number is clear from what follows — *οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν*. In Luke ix. 19 *οἱ δέ* refers regularly to the previously mentioned *μαθηταὶ* vs. 18, and should seem to denote that all gave the answer which follows; but the expressions *ἄλλοι δὲ . . . ἄλλοι δέ* show that the answer was given by only a part of the disciples. Matt. xvi. 14 is more regular: *οἱ δὲ εἶπον · οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννην . . . ἄλλοι δὲ . . . ἕτεροι δέ*.

1. When *ὁ, ἡ, τό* is employed as strictly an Article before a noun, it marks the object as one definitely conceived,¹ whether in

¹ Cf. Epiphan. haer. 1, 9, 4. — *Herm.* praef. ad Eurip. Iphig. Aul. p. 15: articulus quoniam origine pronomen demonstrativum est, definit infinita idque duobus modis, aut designando certo de multis aut quae multa sunt, cunctis in unum colligendis.

- consequence of its nature, or the context, or some circle of ideas
 101 assumed as known; as, Mark i. 32 ὅτε ἔδυν ὁ ἥλιος, Jno. i. 52 ὄψεσθε
 τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεργότα, 1 Cor. xv. 8 ὡς περὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὥφθη κάμοι
 (the only abortion among the apostles), Acts xxvii. 38 ἐκβαλλόμενοι
 τὸν σίτον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν *the grain* (which was the vessel's cargo),
 Luke iv. 20 πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον (which had been handed to him
 97 vs. 17) ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ (the beadle of the synagogue), Jno. xiii.
 5 βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα *the basin* (that stood there, as usual),
 cf. Matt. xxvi. 26 f.; Jno. vi. 3 ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος *into the mountain*
 (situated just there on the farther shore vs. 1), 1 Cor. v. 9 ἔγραψα
 ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ (which Paul had previously written to the Cor.),
 Acts ix. 2 ᾔτησατο ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγὰς *to*
the synagogues (there in Damascus), Rev. xx. 4 ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ
 Χριστοῦ τὰ χίλια ἔτη *the thousand years* (the known duration of
 the Messiah's kingdom), Jas. ii. 25 'Ραὰβ ἡ πόρνη ὑποδεξαμένη
 τοὺς ἀγγέλους *the spies* (mentioned in the history of Rahab), Heb.
 ix. 19 λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τῶν τράγων with allusion
 to Exod. xxiv. 8. So 1 Cor. vii. 3 τῇ γυναικί ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλὴν
 ἀποδιδότω *the* (i.e. matrimonial) *attention due*, vii. 29 ὁ καιρὸς συνε-
 σταλμένος ἐστίν; cf. vs. 26 διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην. The Article
 thus refers to known facts, arrangements, or opinions, Acts v. 37;
 xxi. 38; Heb. xi. 28; 1 Cor. x. 1, 10; 2 Thess. ii. 3; Jno. i. 21;
 ii. 14; xviii. 3; Matt. viii. 4, 12, or to something previously men-
 tioned, Matt. ii. 7 (1); Luke ix. 16 (13); Acts ix. 17, (11); Jno.
 iv. 43 (40); Acts xi. 13 (x. 3, 22); Jas. ii. 3 (2); Jno. xii. 12 (1);
 xx. 1 (xix. 41); Heb. v. 4 (1); Rev. xv. 6 (1). Accordingly ὁ
 ἐρχόμενος is *the Messiah*, ἡ κρίσις *the (last) judgment*, ἡ γραφή *the*
holy Scripture, ἡ σωτηρία *Christian salvation*, ὁ πειράζων *the Tempter*
 — Satan, etc. So also of geographical designations, ἡ ἔρημος *the*
 desert, so called by way of eminence, אֲרָצָה, i.e. according to the
 context, either the Arabian desert (of Mount Sinai) Jno. iii. 14;
 vi. 31; Acts vii. 30, or the desert of Judea Matt. iv. 1; xi. 7.
- 119 To be particularly noticed, further, is the use of a Singular with
 the Article to express in the person of a definite individual a
 whole class; as when we say, *the soldier* must be trained to arms:
 2 Cor. xii. 12 τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, Matt. xii. 35 ὁ ἀγαθὸς
 ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐκβάλλει ἀγαθά, xv. 11; xviii. 17; Luke x. 7; Gal.
 iv. 1; Jas. v. 6. Allied to this is the Singular in parables and
 allegories: Jno. x. 11 ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν,
 where the Good Shepherd is brought forward as an *ideal*; Matt.
 xiii. 3 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖρειν (where Luther incorrectly
 has, *a sower*). See Krü. 86 f.

Note. According to Kühnöl the Article (cf. the emphatic *das* in German) sometimes includes the force of the pronoun *this* (cf. Siebelis, Pausan. I. 50; Boisson. Babr. p. 207), Matt. i. 25 τὸν υἱὸν for τοῦτον τὸν υἱόν, Jno. vii. 17 γινώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, vs. 40 ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου, Acts xxvi. 10 τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἐξουσίαν λαβών, Mark xiii. 20; Acts ix. 2; but the definite Article is quite sufficient in all such cases. Heumann has gone still further in conceding this import of the Article, and is followed by Schulthess (n. krit. Journ. I. 285), who, with Kühnöl, quite erroneously refers to Mth. § 286, where *this* use of the Article, which can hardly occur in prose (except Ionic), is not discussed. Col. iv. 16 ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή we also say, *when the letter is read* (not *the* (this) letter — no such underscoring is needed, since the letter in hand could be the only one thought of); some authorities add αὐτή, but the ancient versions ought not to be reckoned in. In 1 Tim. i. 15 even in German the Demonstr. Pronoun is not required, nor in vi. 13. In 2 Cor. v. 4 the Art. in ἐν τῷ σκήνῳ is not put δεικτικῶς for τοῦτο, but simply refers back to σκῆνος mentioned in vs. 1. In Col. iii. 8 ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμῖς τὰ πάντα is not, *all this* (or *that*) (intensive), but *the whole*, viz. what is immediately (a second time) adduced. Also in Rom. v. 5 ἡ (ἐλπίς) is simply the Article; see Fr. Least of all must ὁ κόσμος be taken for οὐτος ὁ κόσμος; it means *the world* as distinguished from *heaven, the kingdom of heaven*; not *this world* as opposed to another κόσμος. The same judgment must be passed also upon those passages which might be adduced as proofs of this usage in classic authors, Diog. Laert. I. 72 and 86. One cannot possibly comprehend how the apostles could have been induced, in certain passages where they *thought* the demonstrative pronoun, to employ — not that, but — the article, which is much weaker in every instance. One's sense of linguistic propriety revolts against such a use of language. Besides, explicitness is the very characteristic of the later language in general (and of that of the N. T. also).

By Greek authors, particularly Ionic and Doric (Mth. 747; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 204), and afterwards by the Byzant. (Malal. p. 95, 102), the Art. was sometimes used for the Relative. Some have asserted that the same use is found in the N. T. in Acts xiii. 9 Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος (see Schleusner s. h. v.); but incorrectly, for ὁ καὶ Π. is here equivalent to ὁ καὶ καλούμενος Παῦλος (Schaefer. L. Bos. p. 213), and the Article retains its ordinary import, just as in Σ. ὁ Ταρσεύς. Compare the similar Πῖκος ὁ καὶ Ζεὺς Malal. ed. Bonn. p. 19 sq.; Act. Thom. p. 34. On the other hand, compare in Hellenistic writers, Psalt. Sal. xvii. 12 ἐν τοῖς κρίμασι, τὰ ποιεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, if the reading is correct. In Wisd. xi. 15, where ὃν the reading of the Cod. Alex. is probably a correction, τὸν is to be regarded as the Article.

2. The use of the Article which has just been discussed is common to the Greek with all languages that possess an Article.

The following cases on the other hand (cases where in German the definite Art. is not used) are to be noticed as peculiar :

- 103 a. Rev. iv. 7 τὸ ζῶον ἔχον τὸ πρόσωπον ὡς ἀνθρώπου (Xen. C.
 7th ed. 5, 1, 2 ὁμοίαν ταῖς δούλαις εἶχε τὴν ἐσθῆτα, Theophr. ch. 12 [19]
 τοὺς δυνκας μεγάλους ἔχων, Polyæn. 8, 10, 1 a.), Acts xxvi. 24
 μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ ἔφη, xiv. 10 ; 1 Cor. xi. 5 (Aristot. anim. 2, 8 and
 10 ; Lucian. catapl. 11 ; D. S. 1, 70, 83 ; Pol. 15, 29, 11 ; Philostr.
 Ap. 4, 44). We say, *he had eyes like*, etc. ; *he spoke with a loud*
voice, etc. The Greek here by the Article designates what belongs
 to the individual in a definite form, as is more obvious from Heb.
 vii. 24 ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην *he hath the priesthood as un-*
changeable (predicate), Mark viii. 17 ; 1 Pet. ii. 12 ; iv. 8 ; Eph.
 i. 18 and from Matt. iii. 4 εἶχε τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμή-
 λου, Rev. ii. 18 (differing from the preceding examples by the
 addition of the pronoun). From Greek authors, for the former
 cf. Thuc. 1, 10 and 23 ; Plato, Phaedr. 242 b. ; Lucian. dial. deor.
 99 8, 1 ; fugit. 10 ; eun. 11 ; D. S. 1, 52 ; 2, 19 ; 3, 34 ; Ael. anim.
 6th ed. 13, 15 ; Pol. 3, 4, 1 ; 8, 10, 1 ; see Lob. Phryn. 265 ; Krü. Dion.
 H. 126. (The Art. is sometimes omitted e.g. in 2 Pet. ii. 14 ; cf.
 Aristot. anim. 2, 8 and 10 with 2, 11.)

b. 1 Cor. iv. 5 τότε ὁ ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἐκάστῳ *the praise* which
 is due him, Rom. xi. 36 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, xvi. 27 ; Eph.
 iii. 21 ; Gal. i. 5 ; 1 Pet. iv. 11 ; Rev. v. 13 ; Rev. iv. 11 ἄξιός ἐστι
 λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν, Jas. ii. 14 τί τὸ ὄφελος εἶναι πίστιν
 λέγει τις ἔχειν *the advantage* to be expected, 1 Cor. xv. 32 ; 1 Cor.
 ix. 18 τίς μοι ἐστὶν ὁ μισθός (Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 212). In
 general the Art. here denotes that which is due, requisite, etc.,
 Krü. 84. Accordingly it is often used where we employ a Pos-
 sessive Pronoun ; as, Rom. iv. 4 τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθός οὐ λογίζεται
his reward, ix. 22 ; Luke xviii. 15. Cf. Fritzsche, Aristot. Amic.
 pp. 46, 99.

- 121 On the other hand, no example occurs of the use of the Art. discussed
 by Mith. 714 and Rost 438 in appellations (Schæf. Demosth. IV. 365) ;
 for in Rev. vi. 8 ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ θάνατος, viii. 11 τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀστέρους λέγεται
 ὁ ἄψυθος, xix. 13 κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, a name is men-
 tioned in every case which belongs individually and exclusively to the object.

3. Adjectives and participles used substantively are, like sub-
 stantives, rendered definite by the Article ; as, 1 Cor. i. 27 οἱ σοφροί,
 Eph. vi. 16 βέλῃ τοῦ πονηροῦ, Gal. i. 23 ὁ διώκων ὑμᾶς, Tit. iii. 8
 οἱ πεπιστευκότες τῷ θεῷ, 1 Cor. ix. 13 οἱ τὰ ἱερά ἐργαζόμενοι, Matt.
 x. 20 ; 2 Cor. ii. 2 ; x. 16 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 16 ; Heb. xii. 27.

But the place of the noun may be occupied also by an indeclinable part of speech, as an Inf. or an Adverb, 2 Cor. i. 17, or by a phrase, Rom. iv. 14 οἱ ἐκ νόμου, Heb. xiii. 24 οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας (D. S. 1, 83), Acts xiii. 18 οἱ περὶ Παῦλον, Phil. i. 27 τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν etc. 1 Cor. xiii. 10 (Krü. 92); and indeed (after τό) by a whole proposition, Acts xxii. 30 γινῶναι τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται (iv. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 1; Luke xxii. 2, 23, 37), Mark ix. 23 εἶπεν αὐτῷ τό· εἰ δύνῃ; Gal. v. 14 ὁ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου, Rom. viii. 26; xiii. 9; Luke i. 62; [Matt. xix. 18]. (Sentences thus made prominent are usually 104 quotations or interrogations.) Cf. Plato, Gorg. 461 e. and Phaed. 7th ed. 62 b.; rep. 1, 352 d.; Demosth. Con. 728 c.; Lucian. Alex. 20; Mtth. 730 f.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyph. p. 55, and Men. 25. Even an Adverb or a Genitive connected with the Art. (particularly the Neut.) becomes a virtual Substantive (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. 1. 84; Weber, Demosth. p. 237); as, Luke xvi. 26 οἱ ἐκεῖθεν, Jno. viii. 23 τὰ κάτω, τὰ ἄνω, Jno. xxi. 2 οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, Luke xx. 25 τὰ Καίσαρος, Jas. iv. 14 τὸ τῆς αὔριον, 2 Pet. ii. 22 τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας, 1 Cor. vii. 33 τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, 2 Pet. i. 3; 2 Cor. x. 16; Phil. i. 5; Jno. xviii. 6, etc. Krü. 28, 93. So too, in German we can say briefly, *das droben*, *das des morgenden Tags* (what will happen to-morrow), *die des Zebedäus* (those belonging to him, e.g. sons), see § 30, 3. Often, however, we must use a periphrasis; 100 *was dem Kaiser gebührt*; etc. As a mere periphrasis, like τὸ τῆς 6th ed. δόξης for ἡ δόξα 1 Pet. iv. 14, the neut. Art. is not used in the N.T. (Huther in loc. [1st ed.] to the contrary.)

The Neut. τό is sometimes put before nouns to designate them in the abstract, as sounds or combinations of sound: Gal. iv. 25 τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ etc., *the (word) Hagar*.

In many connections a participle used substantively occurs with an article (which is not admissible in German) as a definite predicate to an indefinite subject, Gal. i. 7 τινὲς εἰσιν οἱ παράσσοντες ὑμᾶς, Col. ii. 8 μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν, also Jno. v. 32; Luke xviii. 9; or as a definite subject where, logically, an indefinite was to be expected, Rom. iii. 11 οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνῶν (Jno. v. 45), 2 Cor. xi. 4 εἰ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει. But in Greek in all such cases the quality is conceived of as a definite concrete, 122 only the person, who is this concrete in action, remains indefinite. The παράσσοντες ὑμᾶς really exist, only as individuals they are not more closely designated.¹ *If he that cometh* (the preacher who will not fail to appear

¹ Cf. in Latin *sunt qui existant* as distinguished from *sunt qui existiment*; see Zumpt, S. 490.

among you, — person and name are of no consequence), etc.; *he that understandeth is not* (to be found), etc. So Lucian. abdic. 3 ἦσαν τινὲς οἱ μανίας ἀρχὴν τοῦτ' εἶναι νομίζοντες, Lysias bon. Aristoph. 57 εἰσὶ τινες οἱ προσαναλίσκοντες, Dio Chr. 38, 482 ἤδη τινὲς εἰσιν οἱ καὶ τοῦτο δεδοκότες, and the frequent εἰσιν οἱ λέγοντες Mtth. 713, also Xen. A. 2, 4, 5 ὁ ἡγησάμενος οὐδεὶς ἔσται, Thuc. 3. 83 οὐκ ἦν ὁ διαλύσων, Porphy. abst. 4, 18 οὐδεὶς ἔστω ὁ κολάσων, (Sept. Gen. xl. 8; xli. 8; Deut. xxii. 27; 1 Sam. xiv. 39). See Bhdy. 318 f.; Hm. Soph. Oed. R. 107; Doederl. Soph. Oed. Col. p. 296; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 238. Acts ii. 47 ὁ κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους

105 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ means, *he added to the church those that were being saved* (in
7th ed. consequence of their believing), he increased the church by those in whom preaching took effect; cf. Krü. 89.

Between πολλοί and οἱ πολλοί put substantively (the latter is very rare in the N. T.) we find the usual distinction. Οἱ πολλοί means *the* (known) *many* 2 Cor. ii. 17 contrasted with unity, Rom. xii. 5 οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν (1 Cor. x. 17), or opposed to a definite individual Rom. v. 15, 19, or, without such contrast, *the generality, the* (great) *mass*, the *vulgus* (all but a few) Matt. xxiv. 12; cf. Schaef. Melet. p. 3. 65.

4. Nouns rendered more distinctly definite by οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος as adjectives,¹ always have the Article, inasmuch as they distinguish some individual from the mass (not so in German — nor in English): ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος Luke ii. 25, οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος xiv. 30, τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκεῖνον Matt. xiii. 44, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Matt. vii. 22, ὁ κακὸς δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος Matt. xxiv. 48. Also in Luke vii. 44 the accredited reading is βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα, though ταύτην γυναῖκα, — as the woman was present, — according to Wolf in Dem. Lept. p. 263;

101 Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 243; Krü. 108, would be unexceptionable.
6th ed. Names of persons also with οὗτος usually have the Article; as, Heb. vii. 1; Acts i. 11; ii. 32; xix. 26 (vii. 40).

A noun with πᾶς may either have the Art. or not; πᾶσα πόλις means *every city*, πᾶσα ἡ πόλις *the whole city* Matt. viii. 34 (Rom. iii. 19 ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος); πᾶσαι γενεαὶ *all* generations, whatever their number, πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαὶ Matt. i. 17 *all the* generations, known as a definite plural

123 either from the context or some other source. Cf. Sing. Matt. iii. 10; vi. 29; xiii. 47; Jno. ii. 10; Luke vii. 29; Mark v. 33; Phil. i. 3; Plur. Matt. ii. 4; iv. 24; Luke xiii. 27; Acts xxii. 15; Gal. vi. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 16 (where there is not much authority for the Art.).

¹ It is otherwise when these pronouns are predicates; as, Rom. ix. 8 ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, Luke i. 36 οὗτος μὲν ἔκτος ἐστίν, Jno. iv. 18 τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἶρηκας, ii. 11, etc. Cf. Fr. Mt. 663; Schaef. Plut. IV. 377.

The following are *not* exceptions:¹ Matt. ii. 3 *πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα* *all Jerusalem* (for *Ἱεροσόλυμα* is a proper name, see paragraph 5), Acts ii. 36 *πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ* *the whole house of Israel* (for this too is treated as a proper name 1 Sam. vii. 2 f.; Neh. iv. 16; Judith viii. 6). In Eph. iii. 15 *πᾶσα πατριὰ* obviously means *every* race, Col. iv. 12 *ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ* *in every will of God* (in everything which God wills), 1 Pet. i. 15 *ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ* *in omni vitae modo*.

Still less are the following instances to be considered as exceptional: Jas. i. 2 *πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε*, Eph. i. 8 *ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ* (2 Cor. xii. 12; Acts xxiii. 1) *all (full) joy, in all (full) wisdom* ^{7th ed.} — for they are abstracts denoting a whole, where every wisdom and all wisdom substantially coincide, Krü. 106. Only in Eph. ii. 21 there is preponderating authority for *πᾶσα οἰκοδομή*, though, since the church of Christ as a whole is spoken of, *the whole building* is the proper translation; A C [Sin.**] however, actually give the Art., which owing to the Itacism might easily have fallen out.

Πᾶς joined to a participle not equivalent to a noun demands particular notice: *πᾶς ὀργιζόμενος* means *every one angry* (when, if, while he is angry), cf. 1 Cor. xi. 4, but *πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος* Matt. v. 22 *every angry person* i.e. *πᾶς ὅστις ὀργίζεται*; cf. Luke vi. 47; xi. 10; Jno. iii. 20; xv. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Thess. i. 7, etc.; Krü. 89. This distinction must guide our judgment respecting the double reading Luke xi. 4 *παντὶ ὀφείλουσι* and *παντὶ τῷ ὀφείλουσι*, see Mey.

Τοιοῦτος is joined to a noun without an Art. when *such, any such, of this sort*, is meant; as, Matt. ix. 8 *ἐξουσία τοιαύτη*, Mark iv. 33 *τοιαῦται παραβολαί*, Acts xvi. 24 *παραγγελία τοιαύτη*, 2 Cor. iii. 12. When, on the other hand, a particular object is pointed out as *such a* or *of such a sort*, the noun naturally takes the Art.; as, Mark ix. 37 *ἐν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων* (with reference to *παιδίον* in vs. 36 that represents childhood), Jno. iv. 23; 2 Cor. xii. 3. cf. ^{10th ed.} vs. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 13; Schaef. Demos. III. 136; Schneider, Plat. civ. II. p. 1.

Ἐκαστος, which is seldom employed adjectively in the N. T., is always joined to a substantive without an Art., Orelli, Isocr. Antid. p. 255, (9), Luke vi. 44 *ἐκαστον δένδρον*, Jno. xix. 23 *ἐκάστῳ στρατιῶτῃ*, Heb. iii. 13 *καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν*, Bornem. Xen. An. p. 69. In Greek authors the Art. often accompanies nouns with *ἐκαστος*; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 93 and Hipp. Maj. 164.

¹ Only nouns of the class mentioned in § 19, 1. can, even when joined to *πᾶς* (*the whole*), dispense with the Article, e.g. *πᾶσα γῆ*; cf. Thuc. ed. Porpo, III. II. p. 224. In the N. T. *this* word always has the Article; as, Matt. xxvii. 45 *ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*, Rom. x. 18, etc. Finally, the passages Thiersch, de Pentat. Alex. p. 121, has quoted to prove the omission of the Art. with *πᾶς* (*the whole*) in the Sept., are for the most part quite irrelevant.

Τὸ αἰὶν πνεῦμα means *the same Spirit*; but αἰὶν τὸ πνεῦμα *the Spirit Himself*, Krü. 107. Compare for the former Rom. ix. 21; Phil. i. 30; Luke vi. 38; xxiii. 40; 2 Cor. iv. 13; for the latter Rom. viii. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 28; 2 Cor. xi. 14; Jno. xvi. 27. In both cases the Art. is never omitted in the N. T. with appellatives, — (Luke xx. 42; xxiv. 15 therefore are no exceptions; Bornem. Schol. p. 158.)¹ — as it is sometimes in Greek authors, that is to say in the former case, especially in epic poetry, Hm. Opusc. I. 332 sqq., and in later prose (index to Agath. ed. Bonn. p. 411); in the latter case, even in the better prose authors, Krü. Dion. H. 454 sq.; Bornem. Xen. An. p. 61; Poppo, index ad Cyr. sub verb.

5. Proper names, as they already denote a definite individual, do not *require* the Art., nevertheless, as the established sign of definiteness, it is often joined to them. First, in regard to geographical names:

a. The names of countries (and rivers) more frequently take the Art. than those of cities (cf. *die Schweiz, die Lausitz, die Lombardei, das Elsass, das Tyrol*, etc.).

107 The following never or very seldom occur without the Art.:
7th ed. Ἰουδαία, Ἀχαΐα, Ἰορδάνης, Ἰταλία, Γαλιλαία, Μυσία, Ἀσία (Acts ii. 9, yet see vi. 9; 1 Pet. i. 1), Σαμάρεια (Luke xvii. 11), Συρία (Acts xxi. 3), Κρήτη (yet Tit. i. 5). Only Αἴγυπτος always is used without the Art., and with Μακεδονία usage varies.

b. Names of cities most rarely have the Art. when connected with a preposition (Locella, Xen. Ephes. pp. 223, 242), particularly with ἐν, εἰς, or ἐκ; cf. the words Δαμασκός, Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ἱεροσόλυμα, Τύρσος, Ἐφεσος, Ἀντιόχεια, Καπερναούμ in the concordance. Only Καισάρεια, Ρώμη and Τρωάς vary strangely.

c. Sometimes it is to be observed that a geographical name, when it occurs for the first time in the narration, has not the Article, but takes it on being repeated; as, Acts xvii. 15 ἕως Ἀθηνῶν first time, then vs. 16, xviii. 1, with the Art.; Acts xvii. 10 εἰς ΒέροIAN, then vs. 13 ἐν τῇ Β.; Acts xvi. 9 διαβὰς εἰς Μακεδονίαν, then
125 six times with the Art. (only in xx. 3 without it); Acts xx. 15 ἤλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον, vs. 17 ἀπὸ τῆς Μιλήτου.

Ἱερουσαλήμ has the Art. only when accompanied with an adjective; Rev. iii. 12; Gal. iv. 25 f.; besides in Acts v. 28 in the Acc. (on the contrary, Luke xxiv. 18; Acts i. 19, etc.). Ἱεροσόλυμα occurs in the oblique cases with the Art. only in Jno. (v. 2; x. 22; xi. 18).

108 6. The use of the Art. with names of persons (Bhdy. 317; Mdv.
7th ed. 17) can hardly be reduced to rule. A comparison of separate

¹ In Matt. xli. 50 it is quite unnecessary with *Fr.* to take αἰὶν for δ αἰὶν.

passages will easily convince one of the capricious irregularity of writers,¹ and that he cannot go far with the distinction (Hm. praef. ad Iphig. Aul. p. 16; Fr. Mt. p. 797; Weber, Demosth. p. 414) that a proper name is first introduced without the Art. but takes it when repeated (cf. Matt. xxvii. 24, 58 with 62; Mark xv. 1, 14, 15 with 43; Luke xxiii. 1 ff. with 6 and 13; Jno. xviii. 2 with 5; Acts vi. 5 with 8 f.; viii. 1 with 3 and ix. 8; Acts viii. 5 with 6, 12);² nor with that other (Thilo, Apocr. I. 163 sq.), 'proper names when in the Nominative usually did not take the Art., but frequently had it when in the oblique cases.'³ Hence the authority of the best MSS. must decide mainly whether the Art. shall stand or not.⁴ Proper names which are rendered definite by subjoined names of kindred or of office, usually (even in the classics Ellendt, 108 Arrian. Al. I. 154, yet see Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 417 sq.; Diod. S. 7th ed. Exc. Vat. p. 37) dispense with the Art. (since they first become definite by means of the predicate): Gal. i. 19 'Ιάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, Matt. x. 4 'Ιούδας ὁ 'Ισκαριώτης, ii. 1, 3; iv. 21; xiv. 1; Mark x. 47; xvi. 1; Jno. xviii. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 2; Rom. xvi. 8 ff.; Acts i. 13; xii. 1; xviii. 8, 17. Thus Pausan. e.g. 2, 1, 1; 3, 9, 1; 7, 18, 6; Aeschin. Tim. 179 c.; Diog. L. 4, 32; 7, 10, 13; 8, 58, 63; Demosth. Theocr. 511 c. and Apat. 581 b.; Phorm. 605 b., etc.; Conon. 728 b.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 8; 2, 1, 5; Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 20. 22. 39. 41. 42. 51. 69. 95 etc. On the other hand, with inde- 126 clinable names of persons where the case is not at once apparent from a preposition, appended title, etc. (as in Mark xi. 10; Luke i. 32; Jno. iv. 5; Acts ii. 29; vii. 14; xiii. 22; Rom. iv. 1; Heb. iv. 7) perspicuity seems to require the Art.: Matt. i. 18; xxii. 42; Mark xv. 45; Luke ii. 16; Acts vii. 8; Rom. ix. 13; xi. 25; Gal.

¹ In German, as is well known, the use of the Article before names of persons is provincial. *Der Lehmann*, common in Southern Germany, would sound strange in Northern Germany.

² Even a person who is mentioned for the first time may take the Article when one well known to the reader, or otherwise sufficiently particularized.

³ Compare in particular the want of uniformity in the use of the Article with Πάλος and Πέτρος in the Acts. Πιλάτος in Jno. has always the Article; but in the Acts, never; in Matt. and Mark we find with few exceptions ὁ Πιλάτος. Τίτος has never the Article.

⁴ That in the addresses of letters the names of persons are *without* the Article may be seen from the collections of Greek letters, from Diog. L. (e.g. 3, 22; 8, 49, 80; 9, 13) from Plutarch. Apophth. lac p. 191, from Lucian. parasit. 2, etc. Cf. 2 Jno. 1. The address in 1 Pet. i. 1 Πέτρος . . . ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις, and also Rev. i. 4, are probably to be referred to this rule. Even characterizing predicates dispense with the Article in addresses, Diog. L. 7, 7 and 8.

iii. 8; Heb. xi. 17, etc. (Hence Paul in Rom. x. 19¹ would undoubtedly have written *μὴ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω*; had he regarded 104 Ἰσραὴλ as the object; cf. 1 Cor. x. 18; Luke xxiv. 21). In the 6th ed. genealogies Matt. i. and Luke iii. this is observed throughout, but also where the names are declinable. With regard to proper names, too, the Codd. often vary.

It may be remarked here that the proper name Ἰούδα, where it is to be taken as the name of a country, never runs in the Sept. ἡ Ἰούδα, τῆς Ἰούδας, etc., but always ἡ γῆ Ἰούδα (1 Kings xii. 32; 2 Kings xxiv. 2), or the inflected ἡ Ἰουδαία is used instead (2 Chr. xvii. 19). Hence in Matt. ii. 6 the conjecture τῆς Ἰούδα is even philologically quite improbable.

7. A Substantive with an Article may be the predicate as well as the subject of a proposition, since even the predicate may be conceived of as a definite individual; (though from the nature of the case the substantive which has the Art. will more frequently be the subject). In the N. T. the predicate has the Art. much more frequently than is usually thought, Krü. 91: Mark vi. 3 οὗτος οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων *is not this the* (known) *carpenter?* vii. 15 ἐκεῖνά ἐστι τὰ κοινούντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον *those are the things that* defile etc. xii. 7 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος, xiii. 11 οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς 109 οἱ λαλοῦντες, Matt. xxvi. 26, 28 τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τοῦτό 7th ed. ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, Jno. iv. 42 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, 1 Cor. x. 4 ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός, xi. 3 παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἐστι, xv. 56 ἡ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος, 2 Cor. iii. 17 ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν, 1 Jno. iii. 4 ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία, Phil. ii. 13 ὁ θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν; cf. also Matt. v. 13; vi. 22; xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29; ix. 7; xv. 2; Jno. i. 4, 8, 50; iii. 10; iv. 29; ² v. 35, 39; vi. 14, 50, 51, 63; ix. 8, 19, 20; x. 7; xi. 25; xiv. 21; Acts iv. 11; vii. 32; viii. 10; ix. 21; xxi. 28, 38; Phil. iii. 3, 19; Eph. i. 23; ii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 2; 1 Jno. iv. 15; v. 6; Jude 19; Rev. i. 17; iii. 17; iv. 5; xvii. 18; xviii. 23; xix. 10; xx. 14. In the following passages the Codd. vary more or less: Rev. v. 6, 8; Acts iii. 25; 1 Jno. ii. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 28; Jno. i. 21. In one instance, one of two nouns in the predicate has not, and the other has, the Art.: Jno. viii. 44 *ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶ* 127 *καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ (ψεύδους) he is a liar and the father of it* (falsehood). In Greek authors likewise the Article often occurs before

¹ Fr. ad l. has quoted passages not to the purpose, and for Gal. vi. 6 he must have meant vi. 16.

² Probably also Jno. iv. 37; see Meyer.

the predicate; cf. Xen. M. 3, 10, 1; Plato, Phaedr. 64 c.; Gorg. 483 b.; Lucian. dial. m. 17, 1; see Schaef. Demosth. III. 280; IV. 35; Mtth. 706 f. [A copious collection of examples (yet without any real advance as respects the theory) is contained in Dornseiffen, de articulo ap. Graec. ejusque usu in praedicato. Amstel. 1856. 8vo.]

Hence it follows that the oft-repeated rule: 'the subject of a proposition may be known from its having the Art.' is incorrect, as Glassius and Rambach (Instit. herm. p. 446) long ago perceived. Cf. besides, Jen. Lit. Z. 1834, No. 207.

8. In the language of living intercourse it is utterly impossible that the Article should be omitted where it is decidedly necessary (cf., however, § 19), or employed where it is not demanded.¹ **Op*os 105 can never denote THE mountain, nor τὸ ὄρος A mountain (Kühnöl 6th ed. on Matt. v. 1; Jno. xix. 32 and iii. 10). The N. T. passages — and they were formerly very numerous — in which ὁ, ἡ, τό has been taken for the indefinite Article² (as is pretended after the manner of the Hebrew Art. Gesen. Lg. 655) may be easily disposed of by the attentive student. 1 Thess. iv. 6 *πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι* means *to overreach in business* (cf. im Handel u. Wandel), Jno. ii. 25 *ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ* in the man with whom he (at the time) had to do, (in every man), Krü. 84; cf. Diog. L. 6, 64 *πρὸς τὸν συνιστάντα τὸν παῖδα καὶ λέγοντα ὡς εὐφύεστατός ἐστι . . .* 110 *εἶπε*, etc. to the person (to every one) recommending the boy, etc., 7th ed. Jno. iii. 10 *σὺ εἰ δὲ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* Nicodemus is regarded as the teacher of Israel *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, as he in whom all erudition is concentrated, so that the contrast *καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις* may be made the more palpable (cf. Plato, Crit. 51 a. *καὶ σὺ φήσεις ταῦτα ποιῶν δίκαια πράττειν ὁ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελόμενος* Stallb. Plat. Euth. p. 12; Valcken. Eur. Phoen. p. 552; Krü. 87). In Heb. v. 11 ὁ λόγος is the (our) discourse, the exposition to be presented by us; cf. Plato, Phaedr. 270 a.

On the other hand, the Article may sometimes, with equal (objective) correctness,³ be either employed or omitted (Förtsch ad

¹ Sturz, Lexic. Xenoph. III. 232, quotes passages even from Xenoph. where the Article is alleged to be put for τῷς. Here applies what Schäfer ad Plutarch. somewhere says: tanta non fuit vis barbarae linguae, ut graecae ipsa fundamenta convellere posset.

² This thoughtless rule is not vindicated by reference to such expositors as have attributed to the Art. in certain passages a false emphasis (Glass. 138 sqq.) or have pressed it unduly. The adjustment between the old view and the new, which Böhmer (Introd. in Epist. ad Coloss. p. 291) thinks he has discovered, is unique.

³ Thus it is easy to explain why one language even regularly employs the Article in

Lys. p. 49 sq.) ; as, Jas. ii. 26 τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρόν *the body without spirit* (χωρὶς τοῦ πνεύματος would be without *the* spirit — requisite for the individual body). In Luke xii. 54 good Codd. have *ὅταν ἴδῃτε νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν*, whereas the text. rec. has *τὴν νεφέλην*. Both readings are admissible. With the Article the words mean, *when you see the cloud* (which appears in the sky) *rising from the west*, — if the direction of the moving cloud is from the west. In Col. i. 16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα signifies *the* (existing) *all*, the sum of things, all things collectively (*das All*) ; πάντα would mean, everything that exists, cf. Col. iii. 8 where the two are united. The meaning is but slightly altered by the Article ; yet there is a difference between the two conceptions. In Matt. xxvi. 26 we have λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον (which lay before him) ; but in Mark xiv. 22 ; Luke xxii. 19 ; 1 Cor. xi. 23 (according to the best Codd.) ἄρτον *bread*, or a loaf. Cf. besides, Matt. xii. 1 with Mark ii. 23 and Luke vi. 1 ; Matt. xix. 3 with Mark x. 2 ; Luke ix. 28 with Mark ix. 2. We find the same alternate omission and use of the Article in parallel clauses : Luke xviii. 2 τὸν θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενοι καὶ ἄνθρωπον μὴ ἐντροπόμενοι ; vs. 27 τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ ἐστὶ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ; xvii. 34 ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς· εἷς¹ παραληφθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται (*one . . . the other* ; cf., however, Matt. vi. 24 ; xxiv. 40 f.) ; 1 Jno. iii. 18 μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ μὴδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ (according to the best Codd., cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 786 λόγῳ μὲν ἐσθλά, τοῖσι δ' ἔργοισιν κακά) ; 2 Tim. i. 10 ; 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15 ; Rom. ii. 29 ; iii. 27, 30 ; Heb. ix. 4 ; xi. 38 ; Jude 16 and 19 ; Jno. xii. 5, 6 ; Jas. ii. 17, 20, 26 ; Rev. xx. 1. See Porson, Eurip. Phoen. p. 42, ed. Lips. ; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 58 and his Lex. Soph. II. 247 ; cf. Plat. rep. I. 332 c. and d. ; Xen. A. 3, 4, 7 ; Galen. temper. 1, 4 ; Diog. L. 6, 6 ; Lucian. Eunuch. 6 ; Porphyry. abstin. 1, 14. (The antithesis ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is nowhere fully established Matt. xxviii. 18 ; 1 Cor. viii. 5 ; in both phrases the Art. is wanting without variant in Eph. iii. 15.)

But the *necessity* of the use and of the omission of the Article is obvious in Luke ix. 13 οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ πέντε ἄρτοι καὶ ἰχθύες δύο, vs. 16

certain cases (οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, τοὺς φίλους ποιῆσθαι) in which another does not (*this man, to believe in gods*). Cf. *Sinenis*, Plut. Themist. p. 190 : Multa, quae nos indefinite cogitata pronuntiamus, definite proferre soliti sunt Gracci, ejus, de quo sermo esset, notitiam animo informatam praesumentes. Such remarks Kühn. misuses, ad Mt. p. 123.

¹ This gives support to my exposition of Gal. iii. 20, to which it has always been objected that I have taken εἷς for δὲ εἷς.

λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας; Rom. v. 7 μόλις ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανέται, ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν for a righteous (upright, blameless) man ... for the good man (he, namely, who has proved himself such to him, his benefactor), etc. Rückert has unquestionably misunderstood the passage. In Col. iii. 5 we find four nouns in apposition without the Article, and then a fifth, *πλεονεξία*, marked by 129 the Article, as denoting a sin well-known and especially to be avoided,¹ one which the apostle further characterizes straightway, — for in *ἦτις* etc. I cannot find a reference to all the preceding nouns. In 2 Cor. xi. 18 Paul no doubt designedly wrote *καυχῶνται κατὰ τὴν σάρκα*, different from *κατὰ σάρκα* (as an adverbial expression), though all recent critics regard both as equivalent. See besides Jno. xviii. 20; Rev. iii. 17, and in connection with an apposition, Rom. viii. 23 *νιοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος*, waiting for adoption (that is) the redemption of the body.

9. The Indefinite Article, (which, when necessary, was denoted by *τις*), is expressed [disputed by Meyer on Matt. viii. 19] in certain instances by the (weakened) numeral *εἷς*, — as was especially the case in the later writers;² as, Matt. viii. 19 *προσελθὼν εἷς γραμματεὺς*, etc., Rev. viii. 13 *ἤκουσα ἐνὸς ἀετοῦ*.

But *ἓν* in Jno. vi. 9 is probably not genuine (cf. Matt. ix. 18), and *μίαν συκὴν* in Matt. xxi. 19 means perhaps *one* (solitary) fig-tree. *Εἷς τῶν παρεστηκότων* in Mark xiv. 47 resembles the Latin *unus adstantium*; cf. Matt. xviii. 28; Mark xiii. 1; Luke xv. 26 (Herod. 7, 5, 10; Plutarch. Arat. 5 and Cleom. 7; Aeschin. dial. 107 2, 2;³ Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 249). In Jas. iv. 13 *ἐνιαυτὸν ἓνα* the 6th ed. numeral retains its signification; and still more in 2 Cor. xi. 2; Matt. xviii. 14; Jno. vii. 21. See, in general, Boisson. Eunap. 345; Ast, Plat. legg. 219; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 398; Schaeef. Long. 399.⁴ In Matt. xviii. 24 *εἷς ὀφειλέτης μυρίων ταλάντων*, there 112

7th ed.

¹ Weber, Dem. p. 327. Another case, in which only the last of several connected nouns has, for emphasis' sake, the Article, is discussed by Jacobitz, Lucian. pisc. p. 209, ed. min.

² So also sometimes the Heb. *אֶחָד*; see Gesen. Lg. S. 655. The use of *εἷς* in this sense is founded on the above-mentioned peculiarity of the later language, a predilection for expressiveness.

³ *Τίς τῶν παρ.* would have expressed the same meaning, cf. Luke vii. 36; xi. 1 and elsewhere, like *suorum aliquis* etc. in Latin. Both expressions are logically correct, but not precisely alike. *Unus adstantium* implies a numerical unity — one of several.

⁴ Bretschneider tried, very infelicitously, to reduce to this head also 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6 *μίας γυναῖκος ἄνθρωπος* giving it the meaning, *he shall be the husband of a wife*, that is, a married man. But besides the fact that the apostle's demand that none but married men should undertake the supervision of a church is not sufficiently substantiated by 1 Tim. iii. 4 f., no careful writer can use *εἷς* for the indefinite Art. where an ambiguity

130 is probably a designed antithesis. Also in Mark xiv. 51 var. *εἰς τις unus aliquis* (partitive in Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxii. 50; Jno. xi. 49) *τις* does not take away the arithmetical force of *εἰς* (Heindorf, Plat. Soph. 42; Ast as above, and Plat. Polit. 532; Boisson. Marin. p. 15).

Note 1. In a few particular instances the use or omission of the Article is characteristic of the individual style of the various writers. Thus Gersdorf (Sprachchar. I. 39, 272 ff.) has shown that the four Evangelists almost always write *ὁ Χριστός* (the expected *Messiah*, like *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*), while Paul and Peter employ *Χριστός* (as the appellation had become more of a proper name). In the Epistles of Paul and Peter, however, those cases must be excepted where a noun on which *Χριστός* depends precedes, (as, *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡ ὑπομονὴ τοῦ Χρ., τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χρ.*), since with this noun the Art. is never wanting, Rom. vii. 4; xv. 19; xvi. 16; 1 Cor. i. 6, 17; vi. 15; x. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 4; ix. 13; xii. 9; Gal. i. 7; Eph. ii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 5, etc. Elsewhere, too, Paul not unfrequently employs the Article before *Χριστός*, not merely when accompanied by a preposition, but even when in the Nom., as in Rom. xv. 3, 7; 1 Cor. i. 13; x. 4; xi. 3, etc. Similar diversity on this point occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews, see Bleek on v. 5.

Note 2. MSS. vary extremely in reference to the Article, particularly in those passages where its use or omission is matter of indifference. Here critics must be guided more by the authority of the Codd. than by the supposed style of individual writers. Cf. Matt. xii. 1 *στάνας*, Mark vi. 17 *ἐν φυλακῇ* (better attested than *ἐν τῇ φυλ.*), vii. 37 (*ἀλλόλους*), x. 2 *Φαρισαῖοι*, x. 46 *υἱός*, xi. 4 *πῶλον*, xii. 33 *θυσιῶν*, xiv. 33 *Ἰάκωβον*, xiv. 60 *εἰς μέσον*,
 108 Luke ii. 12 *ἐν φάτιγῃ*, iv. 9 *ὁ υἱός*, iv. 29 *ὥς ὀφρύς τοῦ ὄρους*, vi. 35 *ὑψίστου*,
 6th ed. Jno. v. 1; Rom. x. 15; xi. 19; Gal. iv. 24; 2 Pet. ii. 8, etc.

Note 3. Strange to say, most expositors — when contrary to their custom they have paid attention to the Article in the N. T. — have given an erroneous opinion respecting it. Bengel, to be sure, is an exception. But Kühnöl is an example. After Krause (a sorry voucher), he supposes that in Acts vii. 38 *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, owing to the use of the Article, signifies *certa populi concio*. This meaning may be rendered probable from the context; but *ἡ ἐκκλ.* considered grammatically merely may (as Grotius and others maintain) just as well denote the *congregation* *ἐκκλησία*, and
 113 the Article would be as regular in that case as anywhere. Again, the
 7th ed.

would be occasioned, for men speak and write in order that others may *understand*. The expression, *there came a man*, supposes also numerical unity, and every one thinks of *homo aliquis* as *homo unus*; but *μὴν γυναῖκα ἔχειν* cannot be used for *γυναῖκα ἔχειν*, as it is possible to have several wives (at the same time, or one after another); and consequently numerical unity alone is suggested to everybody. Besides, a person would hardly say, *the bishop must be the husband of a wife*, for, *a husband*, or *married*.

observation of the same scholar on Acts viii. 26 is but half true. Ἡ ἔρημος (ὁδός) must have been used, if Luke wished to distinguish from the rest one particular road known to his readers. But if his meaning was, *this (road) is (now) deserted, untravelled, lies waste*, the Article would be as little appropriate as in German. Expositors have taken notice of the Art. 131 also in 2 Thess. iii. 14 διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, and have on its account denied the possibility of connecting these words with the following σημειώσθε. Perhaps even the omission of the Article in two Codd. may be thus accounted for. Paul, however, might with perfect propriety say διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς σημειώσθε if at the time he presumed upon an answer from the Thessalonians: 'Note him to me in *the* epistle (viz. which I hope to receive from you, or which in that event you must send me).' Yet see Lünem.

Note 4. The place of the Article is immediately before the noun to which it belongs; but conjunctions which cannot begin a sentence are regularly inserted between the Article and its noun: Matt. xi. 30 ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου, iii. 4 ἡ δὲ τροφή, Jno. vi. 14 οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι etc. This is well known, and needs no further illustration. Rost, 436; cf. Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 146.

§ 19. OMISSION OF THE ARTICLE BEFORE NOUNS.

1. Appellatives, which as expressing definite objects should have the Article, are, not merely in the N. T. but in the best Greek authors, employed in certain cases without it. (See Schaefer, Melet. p. 4). This omission, however, only takes place when it produces no ambiguity and leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader whether the object is to be understood as definite or indefinite, i.e.

a. With words which denote objects of which there is but one in existence, and which therefore approximate closely to proper names: thus ἥλιος is almost as common as ὁ ἥλιος, and γῆ (*Earth*) not infrequent for ἡ γῆ, (Poppo, Thuc. III. III. 46); hence the abstract names of virtues and vices, etc.,¹ as ἀρετή, σωφροσύνη, κακία (see Schaefer, Demosth. I. 329; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 52; Krü. 87), likewise the names of the members of the animal body (Held, Plut. Aem. P. p. 248), very often dispense with the Article.

The Article is omitted also before many other appellatives, as 109
6th ed.

¹ To which must be added the names of sciences and arts (as ἱπποσύνη, see Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 98), of magisterial dignities and offices (Schaefer, Demosth. II. 112; Held, Plutarch. Aem. P. p. 138), of seasons of the year, of corporations (Held, l.c. p. 238), and many others (Schoem. ad Isaacum p. 303 and ad Plutarch. Cleom. p. 199). See also Krü. 87.

- 114 πόλις, ἄστυ (Schæf. Plutarch. p. 416 ; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 111 ;
 7th ed. Weber, Dem. p. 235), ἀγρός (Schæf. Soph. Oed. R. 630), δειπνον
 (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 490 ; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 57), even
 132 πατήρ, μήτηρ, ἀδελφός (Schæf. Mel. l.c. and Demosth. I. 328, also
 Eur. Hec. p. 121 ; Plut. l.c. ; Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 134), when from
 the connection no doubt can exist as to what city, field, etc. is
 meant. This omission of the Art., however, is more varied in
 poetry than in prose (Schæf. Demosth. I. 329).

In the N. T., where in general this omission of the Art. is less frequent than in Greek prose,¹ the following instances of abstracts² may be noted : 1 Tim. vi. 11 ; Rom. i. 29 ; Col. iii. 8, and in particular δικαιοσύνη Matt. v. 10 ; Acts x. 35 ; Rom. viii. 10 ; Heb. xi. 33, etc., ἀγάπη Gal. v. 6 ; 2 Cor. ii. 8, πίστις Acts vi. 5 ; Rom. i. 5 ; iii. 28 ; 2 Cor. v. 7 ; 1 Thess. v. 8, etc., κακία 1 Cor. v. 8 ; Tit. iii. 3 ; Jas. i. 21, πλεονεξία 1 Thess. ii. 5 ; 2 Pet. ii. 3, ἁμαρτία Gal. ii. 17 ; 1 Pet. iv. 1 ; Rom. iii. 9 ; vi. 14, etc., σωτηρία Rom. x. 10 ; 2 Tim. iii. 15 ; Heb. i. 14 ; vi. 9. Here belong also, ἀγαθόν Rom. viii. 28 (cf. Fr. in l.), πονηρόν 1 Thess. v. 22, καλόν τε καὶ κακόν Heb. v. 14.

Besides these, we often find in the N. T. without the Article the concretes ἥλιος, γῆ (*Earth*), θεός, πρόσωπον, νόμος, etc., and many others, at least when in connection with prepositions etc. they form phrases of frequent occurrence (Kluit, II. 377 ; Heindorf, Plat. Gorg. p. 265). We arrange them in the following list, founded on the most approved readings :

ἥλιος (Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 467), as in Matt. xiii. 6 ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος (Polyaen. 6, 5 ; Lucian. ver. hist. 2, 12 ; Aelian. 4, 1) ; particularly when joined as genitive to another noun it expresses *one* idea, as ἀνατολή ἡλίου *sunrise* Rev. vii. 2 ; xvi. 12 ; (Her. 4, 8), φῶς ἡλίου *sunlight* Rev. xxii. 5 var. (Plat. rep. 5, 473 e.), δόξα ἡλίου *splendor of the sun* 1 Cor. xv. 41 ; or when the sun is mentioned in an enumeration (in connection with the moon and stars), as Luke xxi. 25 ἔσται σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἀστροῖς *in sun, moon, and stars*, Acts xxvii. 20 (Aesch. dial. 3, 17 ; Plat. Crat. 397 d.).

γῆ, *earth* 2 Pet. iii. 5, 10 ; Acts xvii. 24, ἐπὶ γῆς Luke ii. 14 ; 1 Cor.

¹ So we find in Greek authors usually γένει by *nation*, πλήθει, etc., in the N. T. invariably τῇ γένει Acts iv. 36 ; xviii. 2, 24, also τῇ πλήθει Heb. xi. 12. In Greek authors the omission of the Article before a Nom. even is not unusual, as ἥλιος ἐδύετο Xen. A. 1, 10, 15 ; Lucian. Scyth. 4 ; in the N. T., on the contrary, Mark i. 32 ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος, Luke iv. 40 δύοντος τοῦ ἡλίου, Eph. iv. 26 ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω. So also in the N. T. never σελήνῃ in the nominative, and there are more instances of the same kind.

² The assertion (*Harless* on Eph. S. 320) that the Article can only be omitted before abstracts when they denote virtues, vices, etc., as properties of a subject, is unproved, and cannot be proved on rational grounds. Cf. also Krüger, in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 1838. I. 47.

viii. 5; Eph. iii. 15 (Heb. viii. 4), ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς Mark xiii. 27; cf. Jacobs, Philostr. Imag. p. 266; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 91; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 257. But this word usually has the Art. when it signifies *earth*; in 183 the sense of *land*, on the other hand, the Art. is regularly wanting when 115 the proper name of the country follows, as Matt. xi. 24 γῇ Σοδομόων, [iv. 15] 7th ed. Acts vii. 29 ἐν γῇ Μαδιάμ, vii. 36 ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου, xiii. 19 ἐν γῇ Χαναάν, etc. 110 (but Matt. xiv. 34 εἰς τὴν γῆν Γανησαρέτ). See below, 2. b. Van Hengel's 6th ed. remark on 1 Cor. xv. p. 199 is not to the point.

οὐρανός, οὐρανοί, is seldom without the Article (cf. Jacobs in the Schulzeit. 1831, No. 119, and Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 135): a. In the Gospels only in the phrase ἐν οὐρανῷ, ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἐξ οὐρανῶν, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, but by no means always, even in this case (cf. Matt. vi. 1, 9; xvi. 19; Mark xii. 25; Luke vi. 23, for John except in i. 32 constantly uses ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ); b. By Paul the Art. is regularly omitted in phrases like ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ—van Hengel on 1 Cor. xv. p. 199—is never used by Paul); in 2 Cor. xii. 2 we find also ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ (Lucian. Philopatr. 12) see b. below, and Peter has even in the Nom. οὐρανοί 2 Pet. iii. 5, 12; c. The Article is never omitted in Rev.

θάλασσα, e.g. Acts x. 6, 32 παρὰ θάλασσαν, Luke xxi. 25 ἡχούσης θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου; cf. Demosth. Aristocr. 450 c.; Diod. S. 1, 32; Dio Chr. 35, 436; 37, 455; Xen. Eph. 5, 10; Arrian. Al. 2, 1, 2, and 3; Held, in Act. Philol. Monac. II. 182 sqq. Even ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ Acts vii. 36; (on the other hand, we find the Art. in Heb. xi. 29). It regularly has the Art., however, when opposed to ἡ γῆ.

μεσημβρία in the phrase κατὰ μεσημβρίαν *southwards* Acts viii. 26, περὶ μεσημβρίαν xxii. 6, cf. Xen. A. 1, 7, 6 πρὸς μεσημβρίαν, Plat. Phaedr. 259 a. ἐν μεσημβρ. So, in general, with the names of the quarters of the heavens, Rev. xxi. 13 ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, ἀπὸ βορρᾶ, ἀπὸ νότου, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν (πρὸς νότον Strabo 16, 719, πρὸς ἐσπέραν D. S. 3, 28, πρὸς ἄρκτον Strabo 15, 715 and 719; 16, 749, πρὸς νότου Plat. Crit. 112 c. βασιλῦσα νότου Matt. xii. 42, where, however, it is a sort of proper name), or of a division of the day, as Luke xxiv. 29; Acts xxviii. 23; Krü. 85.

ἀγορά (cf. Bremi, Lys. p. 9; Sintenis, Plutarch. Pericl. p. 80) Mark vii. 4 καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, οὐκ ἐσθίουσι. So in Greek authors often, as Her. 7, 223; 3, 104; Lys. Agor. 2; Dion. H. IV. 2117, 6; 2230, 2; Theophr. ch. 19; Plat. Gorg. 447 a.; Lucian. adv. ind. 4 and eunuch. 1, particularly in the phrase πληθούσης ἀγορᾶς Her. 4, 181; Xen. M. 1, 1, 10; Anab. 1, 8, 1; Aelian. 12, 30; D. S. 13, 48 a.

ἀγρός Mark xv. 21 ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγοῦ (Luke xxiii. 26), Luke xv. 25 ἦν ὁ υἱὸς ἐν ἀγορᾷ. Here, however, the word means, not a single definite field (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγοῦ), but is used generally, *from the country* (as opposed to the town, etc.). So εἰς ἀγρόν Mark xvi. 12, cf. Judg. ix. 27, ἐξ ἀγοῦ Gen. xxx. 16; 1 Sam. xi. 5, etc.; Plat. Theaet. 143 a.; legg. 8, 844 c.

θεός occurs frequently (cf. Hm. Aristoph. nub. v. 816; Bornem. Xen.

- 114 πόλις, ἄστυ (Schæf. Plutarch. p. 416; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 111; ^{7th ed} Weber, Dem. p. 235), ἀγρός (Schæf. Soph. Oed. R. 630), δείπνον (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 490; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 57), even
 132 πατήρ, μήτηρ, ἀδελφός (Schæf. Mel. l.c. and Demosth. I. 328, also Eur. Hec. p. 121; Plut. l.c.; Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 134), when from the connection no doubt can exist as to what city, field, etc. is meant. This omission of the Art., however, is more varied in poetry than in prose (Schæf. Demosth. I. 329).

In the N. T., where in general this omission of the Art. is less frequent than in Greek prose,¹ the following instances of abstracts² may be noted: 1 Tim. vi. 11; Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8, and in particular δικαιοσύνη Matt. v. 10; Acts x. 35; Rom. viii. 10; Heb. xi. 33, etc., ἀγάπη Gal. v. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 8, πίστις Acts vi. 5; Rom. i. 5; iii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 7; 1 Thess. v. 8, etc., κακία 1 Cor. v. 8; Tit. iii. 3; Jas. i. 21, πλεονεξία 1 Thess. ii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 3, ἁμαρτία Gal. ii. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 1; Rom. iii. 9; vi. 14, etc., σωτηρία Rom. x. 10; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. i. 14; vi. 9. Here belong also, ἀγαθόν Rom. viii. 28 (cf. Fr. in l.), πονηρόν 1 Thess. v. 22, καλόν τε καὶ κακόν Heb. v. 14.

Besides these, we often find in the N. T. without the Article the concretes ἥλιος, γῆ (*Earth*), θεός, πρόσωπον, νόμος, etc., and many others, at least when in connection with prepositions etc. they form phrases of frequent occurrence (Kluit, II. 377; Heindorf, Plat. Gorg. p. 265). We arrange them in the following list, founded on the most approved readings:

ἥλιος (Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 467), as in Matt. xiii. 6 ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος (Polyaen. 6, 5; Lucian. ver. hist. 2, 12; Aelian. 4, 1); particularly when joined as genitive to another noun it expresses *one* idea, as ἀνατολή ἡλίου *sunrise* Rev. vii. 2; xvi. 12; (Her. 4, 8), φῶς ἡλίου *sunlight* Rev. xxii. 5 var. (Plat. rep. 5, 473 e.), δόξα ἡλίου *splendor of the sun* 1 Cor. xv. 41; or when the sun is mentioned in an enumeration (in connection with the moon and stars), as Luke xxi. 25 ἔσται σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις *in sun, moon, and stars*, Acts xxvii. 20 (Aesch. dial. 3, 17; Plat. Crat. 397 d.).

γῆ, *earth* 2 Pet. iii. 5, 10; Acts xvii. 24, ἐπὶ γῆς Luke ii. 14; 1 Cor.

¹ So we find in Greek authors usually γένει by *nation*, πλῆθει, etc., in the N. T. invariably τῷ γένει Acts iv. 36; xviii. 2, 24, also τῷ πλῆθει Heb. xi. 12. In Greek authors the omission of the Article before a Nom. even is not unusual, as ἥλιος ἔδυετο Xen. A. 1, 10, 15; Lucian. Scyth. 4; in the N. T., on the contrary, Mark i. 32 ὅτε ἔβυ ὁ ἥλιος, Luke iv. 40 δύνοντος τοῦ ἡλίου, Eph. iv. 26 ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω. So also in the N. T. never σελήνῃ in the nominative, and there are more instances of the same kind.

² The assertion (*Harless* on Eph. S. 320) that the Article can only be omitted before abstracts when they denote virtues, vices, etc., as properties of a subject, is unproved, and cannot be proved on rational grounds. Cf. also *Krüg.* in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 1838. I. 47.

viii. 5 ; Eph. iii. 15 (Heb. viii. 4), ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς Mark xiii. 27 ; cf. Jacobs, Philostr. Imag. p. 266 ; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 91 ; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 257. But this word usually has the Art. when it signifies *earth* ; in the sense of *land*, on the other hand, the Art. is regularly wanting when the proper name of the country follows, as Matt. xi. 24 γῇ Σοδόμων, [iv. 15] Acts vii. 29 ἐν γῇ Μαδιάμ, vii. 36 ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου, xiii. 19 ἐν γῇ Χαναάν, etc. (but Matt. xiv. 34 εἰς τὴν γῆν Γαλιλαίαν). See below, 2. b. Van Hengel's remark on 1 Cor. xv. p. 199 is not to the point.

οὐρανός, οὐρανοί, is seldom without the Article (cf. Jacobs in the Schulzeit. 1831, No. 119, and Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 135) : a. In the Gospels only in the phrase ἐν οὐρανῷ, ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἐξ οὐρανῶν, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, but by no means always, even in this case (cf. Matt. vi. 1, 9 ; xvi. 19 ; Mark xii. 25 ; Luke vi. 23, for John except in i. 32 constantly uses ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) ; b. By Paul the Art. is regularly omitted in phrases like ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ—van Hengel on 1 Cor. xv. p. 199—is never used by Paul) ; in 2 Cor. xii. 2 we find also ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ (Lucian. Philopatr. 12) see b. below, and Peter has even in the Nom. οὐρανοί 2 Pet. iii. 5, 12 ; c. The Article is never omitted in Rev.

θάλασσα, e.g. Acts x. 6, 32 παρὰ θάλασσαν, Luke xxi. 25 ἡχοῦσης θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου ; cf. Demosth. Aristocr. 450 c. ; Diod. S. 1, 32 ; Dio Chr. 35, 436 ; 37, 455 ; Xen. Eph. 5, 10 ; Arrian. Al. 2, 1, 2, and 3 ; Held, in Act. Philol. Monac. II. 182 sqq. Even ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ Acts vii. 36 ; (on the other hand, we find the Art. in Heb. xi. 29). It regularly has the Art., however, when opposed to ἡ γῆ.

μεσημβρία in the phrase κατὰ μεσημβρίαν *southwards* Acts viii. 26, περὶ μεσημβρίαν xxii. 6, cf. Xen. A. 1, 7, 6 πρὸς μεσημβρίαν, Plat. Phaedr. 259 a. ἐν μεσημβρ. So, in general, with the names of the quarters of the heavens, Rev. xxi. 13 ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, ἀπὸ βορρᾶ, ἀπὸ νότου, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν (πρὸς νότον Strabo 16, 719, πρὸς ἐσπέραν D. S. 3, 28, πρὸς ἄρκτον Strabo 15, 715 and 719 ; 16, 749, πρὸς νότον Plat. Crit. 112 c. βασιλῖςsa νότου Matt. xii. 42, where, however, it is a sort of proper name), or of a division of the day, as Luke xxiv. 29 ; Acts xxviii. 23 ; Krü. 85.

ἀγορά (cf. Bremi, Lys. p. 9 ; Sintenis, Plutarch. Pericl. p. 80) Mark vii. 4 καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, οὐκ ἐσθίουσι. So in Greek authors often, as Her. 7, 223 ; 3, 104 ; Lys. Agor. 2 ; Dion. H. IV. 2117, 6 ; 2230, 2 ; Theophr. ch. 19 ; Plat. Gorg. 447 a. ; Lucian. adv. ind. 4 and eunuch. 1, particularly in the phrase πληθούσης ἀγορᾶς Her. 4, 181 ; Xen. M. 1, 1, 10 ; Anab. 1, 8, 1 ; Aelian. 12, 30 ; D. S. 13, 48 a.

ἀγρός Mark xv. 21 ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ (Luke xxiii. 26), Luke xv. 25 ἦν ὁ υἱὸς ἐν ἀγρῷ. 'Here, however, the word means, not a single definite field (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγροῦ), but is used generally, *from the country* (as opposed to the town, etc.). So εἰς ἀγρόν Mark xvi. 12, cf. Judg. ix. 27, ἐξ ἀγροῦ Gen. xxx. 16 ; 1 Sam. xi. 5, etc. ; Plat. Theaet. 143 a. ; legg. 8, 844 c.

θεός occurs frequently (cf. Hm. Aristoph. nub. v. 816 ; Bornem. Xen.

conv. p. 142; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 121), and beyond comparison the most frequently in the Epistles, *without* the Art., particularly when it is
 134 dependent as a Gen. upon another (anarthrous) noun, as Luke iii. 2; Rom. iii. 5; viii. 9; xv. 7, 8, 32; 1 Cor. iii. 16; xi. 7; 2 Cor. i. 12; viii. 5; Eph. v. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 13, in the phrases *θεὸς πατήρ* 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; 116 Gal. i. 1; Phil. i. 2; ii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 2, *υἱοὶ* or *τέκνα θεοῦ* Matt. v. 9; Rom. 7th ed. viii. 14, 16; Gal. iii. 26; Phil. ii. 15; 1 Jno. iii. 1, 2 (where these nouns 111 are also without the Art.), with Prepositions *ἀπὸ θεοῦ* Jno. iii. 2; xvi. 30; 6th ed. Rom. xiii. 1; 1 Cor. i. 30; vi. 19, *ἐν θεῷ* Jno. iii. 21; Rom. ii. 17, *ἐκ θεοῦ* Acts v. 39; 2 Cor. v. 1; Phil. iii. 9, *κατὰ θεόν* Rom. viii. 27, *παρὰ θεῷ* 2 Thess. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 4, also with Adject. 1 Thess. i. 9 *θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ*. (In Jno. i. 1 *θεὸς ᾧν ὁ λόγος* the Art. could not have been omitted if John had intended to designate the λόγος as ὁ θεός, because in this connection *θεός* alone would be ambiguous. But that John designedly wrote *θεός* is apparent, partly from the distinct antithesis *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* verses 1, 2, and partly from the whole description of the λόγος. Similarly stands in 1 Pet. iv. 19 *πιστὸς κτίστης* without the Art.)

πνεῦμα ἅγιον, seldom *πνεῦμα θεοῦ* Acts viii. 15, 17; Rom. viii. 9, 14; Heb. vi. 4; 2 Pet. i. 21; 1 Cor. xii. 3, *πνεῦμα* Phil. ii. 1, also *ἐν πνεύματι* Eph. ii. 22; vi. 18; Col. i. 8, *ἐν πν. ἁγίῳ* Jude 20. (The baptismal formula *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* is cited in Acta Barn. p. 74 thus: *εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς κ. υἱοῦ κ. ἁγίου πν.*)

πατήρ, Heb. xii. 7 *υἱὸς ὃν οὐ παιδεύει πατήρ*, Jno. i. 14 *μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*, and in the formula *θεὸς πατήρ (ἡμῶν)*; *μήτηρ* only in the phrase *ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς* Matt. xix. 12.

ἀνὴρ (*husband*), 1 Tim. ii. 12 *γυναῖκὶ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός* Eph. v. 23 (but 1 Cor. xi. 3); Luke xvi. 18 *πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ . . . πᾶς ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν*, does not necessarily come under this head, though the first *γυνή* has the Art.; for the last words are to be translated: *he who marries a woman dismissed from a husband*. But in Acts i. 14 one would expect the Art. before *γυναῖξί* (see de W.), not so much in Acts xxi. 5; cf., however, above.

πρόσωπον, e.g. Luke v. 12 *πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον*, xvii. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 25; cf. Sir. i. 17; Tob. xii. 16; Heliod. 7, 8 *ρίπτει ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον*, Achill. Tat. 3, 1; Eustath. amor. Ismen. 7, p. 286 (Heliod. 1, 16), Acts xxv. 16 *κατὰ πρόσωπον*, 2 Cor. x. 7 (Exod. xxviii. 27; xxxix. 13, etc.).

δεξιά, *ἀριστερά*, and the like, in the formulas *ἐκ δεξιῶν* Matt. xxvii. 38; xxv. 33; Luke xxiii. 33, *ἐξ εὐνύμων* Matt. xx. 21; xxv. 41; Mark x. 37; Krü. 86.

ἐκκλησία, 3 Jno. 6 *οἱ ἐμαρτύρησάν σου τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐνώπιον ἐκκλησίας*, 1 Cor. xiv. 4 (*ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ* 1 Cor. xiv. 19, 35?).

θάνατος, Matt. xxvi. 38 *ὥς θανάτου* (Sir. xxxvii. 2; li. 6), Phil. ii. 8, 30 *μέχρι θανάτου* (Plat. rep. 2, 361 c.; Athen. 1, 170), Jas. v. 20 *ἐκ θανάτου* (Job v. 20; Prov. x. 2; Plat. Gorg. 511 c.), Luke ii. 26 *μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον*,

Rom. vii. 13 *κατεργαζομένη θάνατον*, i. 32 *ἄξιοι θανάτου*, 2 Cor. iv. 11 *εἰς θάνατον παραδόμεθα*, etc.; cf. Himer. 21 *μετὰ θάνατον*, Dion. H. IV. 2112, 135 2242; cf. Grimm, *Buch der Weish.* S. 26.

θύρα, in the Plur. *ἐν θύραις ad fores* Matt. xxiv. 33; Mark xiii. 29; cf. Plutarch. Themist. 29; Athen. 10, 441; Aristid. Orat. Tom. II. 43 (on the other hand in the Sing. *ἐπὶ τῇ θύρᾳ* Acts v. 9). See Sintenis, Plutarch. Them. p. 181.

νόμος, meaning the *Mosaic law*, Rom. ii. 12, 23; iii. 31; iv. 13, 14, 15; 117 v. 13, 20; vii. 1; x. 4; xiii. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 20; Gal. ii. 21; iii. 11, 18, 21; 7th ed. iv. 5; Phil. iii. 6; Heb. vii. 12, etc.; always as a Gen. where the principal noun has no Art.: *ἔργα νόμου*, and the like. (In the Gospels, except Luke ii. 23, 24, where, however, a qualifying Gen. follows, we find constantly *ὁ νόμος*.) As to the Apocr., see Wahl, *clav.* 343. Also cf. Bornem. 112 6th ed. Acta p. 201.

ῥῆμα, meaning *God's word*, followed by *θεοῦ* Rom. x. 17; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5, and without *θεοῦ* Eph. v. 26.

νεκροί, the *dead*, always (except in Eph. v. 14) in the phrases *ἐγείρειν*, *ἐγείρεσθαι*, *ἀναστήναι ἐκ νεκρῶν* Matt. xvii. 9; Mark vi. 14, 16; ix. 9, 10; xii. 25; Luke ix. 7; xvi. 31; xxiv. 46; Jno. ii. 22; xii. 1, 9, 17; xx. 9; xxi. 14; Acts iii. 15; iv. 2; x. 41; xiii. 30; xxvi. 23; Rom. iv. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc., and also *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* (both without Art.) Acts xvii. 32; xxiv. 21; Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21, 42, etc. Only in Col. ii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 10 is a var. noted. (On the other hand, almost always *ἐγείρεσθαι*, *ἀναστήναι ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν*, Matt. xiv. 2; xxvii. 64; xxviii. 7.) *Νεκροί* elsewhere designates *dead persons* (Luke vii. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 15, 29, 32, also 1 Pet. iv. 6 etc.), but *οἱ νεκροί*, *THE dead*, as a definitely conceived totality, Jno. v. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 2 Cor. i. 9; Col. i. 18.¹ The Greeks, too, regularly omit the Art. before this word.

μέσον, in the phrase (*ἵστησεν*) *ἐν μέσῳ* Jno. viii. 3; Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 126, *εἰς μέσον* Mark xiv. 60 (but *εἰς τὸ μέσον* Jno. xx. 19, 26; Luke iv. 35; vi. 8), *ἐκ μέσου* 2 Thess. ii. 7; more commonly still where a qualifying Gen. follows, Mark vi. 47 *ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης*, Luke viii. 7 *ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν*, Acts xxvii. 27 *κατὰ μέσον τῆς νυκτός* (Theophr. ch. 26). See Wahl, *clav. apocr.* p. 326.

κόσμος, always in the phrases *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3, *πρὸ κατ. κ.* Jno. xvii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 20, *ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου* Rom. i. 20, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου* Matt. xxiv. 21; in the Epistles also *ἐν κόσμῳ* Rom. v. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 4; xiv. 10; Phil. ii. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. v. 9. The Nom. is but rarely without the Art., as Gal. vi. 14 *ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται*; and according to the best Codd. Rom. iv. 13 must be read: *κληρονόμον εἶναι κόσμου*.

κτίσις, *creation* (i.e. thing created, the world), in the phrase *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*

¹ The distinction alleged by *van Hengel* on 1 Cor. xv. p. 135 between *νεκροί* and *οἱ νεκροί* has no foundation (either in principle or in usage).

κτίσεως Mark x. 6; xiii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 4. Yet *πάσα κτίσις* 1 Pet. ii. 13; 136 Col. i. 15 (see Mey.) is everywhere distinguished from *πάσα ἡ κτίσις* Mark xvi. 15; Rom. viii. 22; Col. i. 23.

ώρα, as in 1 Jno. ii. 18 *ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστί*; particularly with numerals, as *ἦν ὥρα τρίτη* Mark xv. 25; Jno. xix. 14, *περὶ τρίτην ὥραν* Matt. xx. 3; Acts x. 9, *ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης* Mark xv. 33, *ἀπὸ ἑκτῆς ὥρας* Matt. xxvii. 45, etc.; cf. D. S. 4, 15; Held, Plut. Aem. P. p. 229. (In another relation *ὥρα χειμέριος* Aelian. 7, 13, *ὥρα λουτροῦ* Polyæn. 6, 7.) But so with other nouns also when joined to ordinal numerals, as *πρώτη φυλακή* Heliod. 1, 6; Polyæn. 2, 35; cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 152, and *ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας* Phil. i. 5.

118 *καιρός*, in the phrases *πρὸ καιροῦ before the time* Matt. viii. 29; 1 Cor. 7th ed. iv. 5, *κατὰ καιρόν* Rom. v. 6 (Lucian. Philops. 21) and *ἐν καιρῷ* Luke xx. 10 113 (Xen. C. 8, 5, 5; Polyb. 2, 45; 9, 12, etc.), also *ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* 1 Pet. i. 5 6th ed. like *ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* 2 Tim. iii. 1; Jas. v. 3.

ἀρχή (Schæf. Demosth. III. 240), especially in the common phrases *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* Matt. xix. 8; Acts xxvi. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Jno. i. 1; ii. 7, etc. (Her. 2, 113; Xen. C. 5, 4, 12; Aelian. 2, 4), *ἐξ ἀρχῆς* Jno. vi. 64; xvi. 4 (Theophr. ch. 28; Lucian. dial. mort. 19, 2, and merc. cond. 1) and *ἐν ἀρχῇ* Jno. i. 2; Acts xi. 15; (Plat. Phædr. 245 d.; Lucian. gall. 7). All these regularly in the Sept. also.

κύριος, which in the Gospels usually designates *God* (the O. T. *Lord*, cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 169), and in the Epistles especially Paul's (in accordance with the growth of Christian phraseology) most frequently *Christ*, the *Lord* (Phil. ii. 11; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff.; Krehl, N. T. Wörterb. S. 360), like *θεός* often dispenses with the Article, particularly when it is joined to a preposition (chiefly in established phrases like *ἐν κυρίῳ*) or occurs in the Gen. (1 Cor. vii. 22, 25; x. 21; xvi. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 18; xii. 1) or precedes *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; Gal. i. 3; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; iii. 20). It had already become almost a proper name. It has been erroneously maintained (Gabler, in his neuest. theol. Journ. IV. S. 11–24) that the *meaning* of the word depends on the insertion or omission of the Article. Christ, the Lord, whom all knew as such and who was so often mentioned, the apostles could most easily style *κύριος*, just as *θεός* nowhere occurs more frequently without the Article than in the Bible; cf. my Progr. de sensu vocum *κύριος* et *ὁ κύριος* in Actis et Epist. Apostolor. Erlang. 1828. 4to. Even in Paul's writings, however, the Article predominates.

διάβολος the devil, usually has the Article. Only in 1 Pet. v. 8 we find *ὁ ἀντίδικος ἡμῶν διάβολος* in apposition, and in Acts xiii. 10 *ὁ υἱὲ διαβόλου*.¹

¹ Ἄγγελος does not belong to the class of words of which a list is given above. When used in the Sing. without an Article, it always signifies *an angel* (one of the many), and so in the Plur. *ἄγγελοι*, *angels*, e.g. 1 Tim. iii. 16; Gal. iii. 19, etc.; on the other hand *οἱ ἄγγελοι* the *angels* as a class of beings. Accordingly 1 Cor. vi. 3 *ὅτι ἄγγέλους κρινοῦμεν* must be translated, *that we shall judge angels*, — not the angels, the whole multitude of

That appellatives (particularly in the Nom.) are without the Article in 137 titles and superscriptions also, is easily accounted for; cf. Matt. i. 1 βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Mark i. 1 ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Rev. i. 1 ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

2. b. The Article is likewise often omitted before a noun followed by a Gen. designating the singly existing object as something appertaining to this individual ¹ (Schæf. Soph. Oed. C. 1468; Bornem. 119 Xen. Cyr. p. 219; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 421; ad Plut. Agid. p. 105; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 277; Herm. Lucian. conser. hist. 7th ed. p. 290), ² e.g. Matt. [xvi. 18 πύλαι ᾧδου] xvii. 6 ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν cf. xxvi. 39 (Isa. xlix. 23 ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς; on the other hand, Matt. xxvi. 67 εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, Rev. vii. 11), Luke i. 51 ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ, Rom. i. 1 εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ (where Rück. still makes unnecessary difficulties), Eph. i. 20 ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ (Heb. i. 3; Matt. xx. 21), Luke xix. 42 ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου, 1 Cor. ii. 16 τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, 1 Pet. iii. 12, 20; Jas. i. 26; Mark viii. 3; xiii. 27; Rom. i. 20; ii. 5; Luke i. 5; ii. 4, 11; xiii. 19; xix. 13; Heb. xii. 2; 1 Cor. x. 21; xii. 27; xvi. 15; Phil. ii. 16; iv. 3; Eph. i. 4, 6, 12; iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 8; 2 Thess. i. 9; ii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 6; iii. 10; Jude 6 (Acts viii. 5), etc. The same occurs very frequently in the Sept. also, as 1 Sam. i. 3, 7; iv. 6; v. 2; Exod. iii. 11; ix. 22; xvii. 1; Cant. v. 1; viii. 2; Judith ii. 7, 14; iii. 3, 9; iv. 11; v. 8; vi. 20; 1 Macc. ii. 50; v. 66; 3 Esr. i. 26. (But in 1 Cor. iv. 14 ὡς τέκνα μου ἀγαπητά it was necessary to omit the Article, since the Cor. were not alone *the* beloved children of Paul. In Luke xv. 29 οὐδέποτε ἐντολὴν σου παρῆλθον means *a command of thine*, but in Acts i. 8 λήψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος must be translated: *ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost shall have descended.*)³

The Article is thus omitted sometimes when a numeral defines

angels, but — angels, who, and as many of them as, fall under the κρῖσις. On *νιοθεσία* Rom. viii. 23, see *Fr.* against Rückert. That the word in apposition sometimes has the Article, when the principal noun is anarthrous, has been remarked by Geel, ad Dion. Chr. Olymp. p. 70.

¹ Accordingly Jno. v. 1 ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων could not be translated: *the festival of the Jews* (Passover). The Article, however, has much authority in its favor, and has been admitted into the text by Tdf. [ed. II. yet not in ed. VII.].

² The Hebrew language, as is well known, does not in this construction employ an Article before the governing noun. On this Hengstenberg, Christol. II. 565, founded a new discovery, which Lücke on Jno. v. 1 has suitably appreciated.

³ Gersdorf, I. 316 ff., has not duly distinguished the cases. The Article is both used and omitted in one and the same clause, Luke xxiii. 46 εἰς χεῖρας σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου etc.

the noun more nearly ; as, Acts xii. 10 διελθόντες πρώτην φυλακὴν καὶ δευτέραν, Mark xv. 25 ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, xv. 138 33 ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης, Luke iii. 1 ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας etc., 2 Cor. xii. 2 ; Eph. vi. 2 (Phil. i. 5 var.) ; cf. from Greek authors Lysias 7, 10 τρίτῳ ἔτει, Plato, Min. 319 c. and Hipp. maj. 286 b. ; Antiph. 6, 42 ; Andoc. 4, 17 ; Diog. L. 7, 135, 138, 141 sqq. (but 7, 150, 151, 153). See above, 1. a. under ὥρα, p. 124.

By this usage may be defended also Matt. xii. 24 ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβοὺλ, ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων, the reading found in all MSS. Fr. (ad Mt. p. 774), without the authority of MSS., substituted ἐν Β. τῷ ἄρχ. etc., as he deemed this omission of the Article strange.

In Greek authors such omission of the Article, especially when the noun is preceded by a preposition, is by no means rare ; cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 13 περὶ καταλύσεως τῆς στρατιᾶς, Apol. Socr. 30 ἐν καταλύσει τοῦ βίου, Mem. 120 1, 5, 2 ἐπὶ τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου, 4, 3, 16 ; Plat. Phaedr. 237 c. ; Lys. Agorat. 2 7th ed ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου τοῦ ἡμετέρου, and further on πατρίδα σφετέραν αὐτῶν 115 καταλιπόντες, Lucian. Scyth. 4 βίον αὐτῶν, Dio Chr. 38, 471 ὑπὲρ γενέσεως 6th ed αὐτῆς, Strabo 15, 719 ὑπὸ μήκους τῶν ὁδῶν (17, 808), Thuc. 2, 38 διὰ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως, 7, 72. So in German, also, the Article is usually omitted after a preposition, e.g. über Auflösung des Räthsels etc. In Greek authors, however, in such cases even the Gen. is frequently anarthrous, or if not, it *precedes* ; as, τῶν χωρίων χαλεπότης ; cf. Krü. Dion. II. p. 168 ; Jacobs, Athen. p. 18 sq. ; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 130. (Xen. C. 8, 6, 16 ; Mem. 1, 4, 12 ; Thuc. 1, 1 ; 6, 34 ; 8, 68).

3. c. When several consecutive nouns¹ connected by καὶ and denoting different objects² agree in case and number, each of them regularly takes the Article if they *differ* in gender ; — not merely when they signify persons, as Acts xiii. 50 τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας . . . καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως (Luke xiv. 26 ; Eph. vi. 2 ; Acts xxvi. 30), but also inanimate objects Col. iv. 1 τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε, Rom. viii. 2 ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, Matt. xxii. 4 ; Luke x. 21 ; Rom. xvi. 17 ; Phil. iv. 7 ; 1 Cor. ii. 4 ; Eph. ii. 1 ; Rev. i. 2 ; xiv. 7 ; Heb. iii. 6 ; cf. Xen. C. 2, 2, 9 σὺν τῷ θώρακι κ. τῇ κοπιδί, Plut. virt. mul. p. 210 διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα κ. τὴν ἀρετὴν, Dion. H. IV. 2245, 4 ἐπὶ τοῦ τόκου καὶ

¹ Benseler, Isocr. Arcopag. p. 290 sqq., has collected much from Isocrates on the repetition and the non-repetition of the Article with connected nouns (Subst. Adject. Participle also Infin.), but without throwing entire light on the subject. Cf. also Tholuck, Literar. Anzeig. 1837, No. 5.

² For a repetition of the Article is not admissible before connected nouns which, for instance, are merely predicates of one and the same person, as in Col. iii. 17 τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ, 2 Pet. i. 11 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ. Χρ., Eph. vi. 21 ; Mark vi. 3 ; Acts iii. 14.

τῆς λοχείας, 2117, 17 τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ τὰ ὅπλα, 2089, 14; D. S. 1, 50, 51, 86; Philostr. her. 3, 2; Diog. L. 3, 18; 5, 51; Herod. 2, 10, 15; Strabo 3, 163; 15, 712; Plutarch. aud. poet. 9 in. and Themist. 8; Isocr. Areop. p. 334; Plat. Charm. p. 160 b.; Sext. Emp. adv. 139 Math. 2, 58.

In these connections the repetition of the Article appeared *grammatically* necessary, while at the same time the ideas connected are mostly such as require to be grasped separately. See under 4.

Where, however, the ideas do not require to be sharply distinguished, or where an adjective is joined to the first noun and to be extended also to the second, the repetition of the Article does not take place even when the nouns differ in gender; and the *one* Article that precedes serves alike for all the nouns that follow; as, Col. ii. 22 τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Luke xiv. 23 ἐξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς, i. 6 ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιομασι τοῦ κυρίου, Mark xii. 33; Rev. v. 12.

Such passages are to be found likewise in Greek authors, — and 121 far more frequently indeed, — in poetry (Hm. Eurip. Hec. p. 76) ^{7th ed.} as well as in prose, without any very precise reference to the sense, e.g. Plat. rep. 9. 586 d. τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ λόγῳ, legg. 6, 784 ὁ σωφρονῶν ¹¹⁶ καὶ σωφρονούσα, 6. 510 c.; apol. 18 a.; Crat. 405 d.; Aristot. anal. ^{6th ed.} post. 1, 26; Thuc. 1, 54; Lycurg. 30; Lucian. parasit. 13; Herod. 8, 6, 11; Ael. anim. 5, 26; cf. also Krü. Dion. p. 140, and Xen. Anab. p. 92, Bornem. Cyrop. p. 668.

When such nouns are disjoined by ἢ, the Article is invariably repeated; as, Matt. xv. 5 τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί, Mark iv. 21 ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην, Rev. xiii. 17.

When the connected nouns differ in number the repetition of the Article is naturally and grammatically almost indispensable; as, Col. ii. 13 ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, Eph. ii. 3 τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοῶν, 1 Tim. v. 23; Tit. ii. 12; Acts xv. 4, 20; xxviii. 17; Matt. v. 17; Rev. ii. 19. Cf. Plato, Crito 47 c. τὴν δόξαν καὶ τοὺς ἐπαίνους, Dion. H. IV. 2238, 1 ὑπὸ τῆς παρθένου καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν γυναικῶν. Yet Xen. A. 2, 1, 7 ἐπιστήμων τῶν περὶ τὰς τάξεις τε καὶ ὅπλομαχίαν, Agath. 14, 12 τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ πόλεμον. But 1 Cor. iv. 9 θεάτρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις does not come under this head; the last two nouns without the Art. particularize the τῷ κόσμῳ: *the world*, — *angels as well as men*.

4. d. If, however, such nouns connected by καὶ are of the *same* gender, the Article is *omitted*

1) When the connected nouns are regarded as only parts of one whole, or members of one community (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex.

p. 253 ; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 455) ; as, Mark xv. 1 *συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων*
 140 (where the elders and scribes are designated as only *one* class of individuals, in distinction from the high priests), Luke xiv. 3, 21 ; Col. ii. 8, 19 ; Eph. ii. 20 ; v. 5 ; Phil. i. 7 ; ii. 17 ; Acts xxiii. 7 ; 2 Pet. i. 10 (Xen. A. 2, 2, 5 ; 3, 1, 29 ; Plat. Phil. 28 e. ; Dion. H. IV. 2235, 5 ; Plutarch. aud. poet. 1 in. 12 in.).

2) When between the first noun and its Article a Gen. or some other attributive intervenes, which also qualifies the second ; as, 1 Thess. ii. 12 *εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν*, iii. 7 *ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει καὶ ἀνάγκῃ ἡμῶν*, Rom. i. 20 *ἣ τε αἰδὸς αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης*, Phil. i. 25 ; Eph. iii. 5. Cf. Dion. H. IV. 2246, 9 *τὰς αὐτῶν γυναῖκας καὶ θυγατέρας*, 2089, 4 ; D. S. 1, 86 *τὴν προειρημένην ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τιμὴν*, 2, 18 ; Ael. anim. 7, 29 ; Aristot. eth. Nicom. 4, 1, 9 ; 7, 7, 1.¹ So also when the common Genitive follows the second noun ; as, Phil. i. 20 *κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαταδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα*
 122 *μου*, i. 7 *ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ κ. βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, 1 Pet. ii. 25
 7th ed. (on Phil. i. 19 see Mey.). Cf. Benseler p. 293 sq.

Under 1. it should be noted, that in a series of nouns forming a *single* category, only the first has the Article ; as, Acts xxi. 25 *φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς . . . τὸ αἷμα καὶ πνικτὸν καὶ πορνείαν*, Eph. iii. 18 *τί τὸ πλάτος κ. μήκος κ. βάθος*
 117 *κ. ὕψος*, Jno. v. 3 ; 1 Cor. v. 10 ; cf. Her. 4, 71 *θάπτονται καὶ τὸν οἰνοχόον κ.*
 6th ed. *μάγειρον κ. ἵπποκόμον κ. διήκονον κ. ἀγγελιφόρον*, etc. ; Plato, Euthyph. p. 7 c. For instances with proper names, see Acts i. 13 ; xv. 23.

5. On the other hand, the Article is *used* in the case under consideration, commonly

a. When each of the connected nouns is to be regarded as independent (Schaeff. Dem. V. 501 ; Weber, Dem. 268), 1 Cor. iii. 8 *ὁ φυτεύων καὶ ὁ ποτιζὼν ἓν εἰσιν*, Acts xxvi. 30 *ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμὼν*, etc., Mark ii. 16 *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* (two separate classes of Christ's adversaries combined for one object), Jno. xix. 6 *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται* *the high priests and the* (subordinate) *attendants* (with their attendants), ii. 14 ; xi. 47 ; Mark ii. 18 ; vi. 21 ; xi. 9, 18, 27 ; xii. 13 ; xiii. 17 ; xiv. 43 ; Luke i. 58 ; viii. 24 ; xi. 39, 42 ; xii. 11 ; xv. 6, 9 ; xx. 20 ; xxi. 23 ; xxiii. 4 ; Acts iv. 23 ; vi. 4, 13 ; xiii. 43 ; xv. 6 ; xxiii. 14 ; xxv. 15 ; Rom. vi. 19 ; Eph. iii. 10, 12 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 2 ; Phil. iv. 6 ; 1 Tim. iv. 6 ; Jas. iii. 11 ; 1 Jno. ii. 22, 24 ; iv. 6 ; v. 6 ; Rev. vi. 15 ; vii. 12 ; xiii. 10, 16 ; xxii. 1 ; cf. Xen. athen. 1, 4 ; Lys. Agorat. 2 ;

¹ In this case, even when the nouns are of different gender, as in Lysias in Andoc. 17 *περὶ τὰ ἀλλότρια ἱερὰ καὶ ἑορτὰς ἡσέβει*. Cf. above, 3.

adv. Nicom. 3; Isocr. Areop. p. 352; permut. 736; D. S. 1, 30 141 (διὰ τὴν ἀνδρίαν καὶ τὴν σπάνιν τῆς ἀπάσης τροφῆς) 3, 48; 5, 29; 17, 52; Plut. virt. mul. p. 214 ἔπεμψε τὴν γυναῖκα κ. τὴν θυγατέρα, Ael. anim. 7, 29; Diog. L. 5, 52;¹ Weber, Demosth. p. 395.

So especially when the two nouns are connected by τε . . . καὶ or καὶ . . . καὶ, and thus more prominently exhibited as independent (Schaeef. Demosth. III. 255; IV. 68) Luke xxiii. 12; Acts v. 24; xvii. 10, 14; xviii. 5; Phil. iii. 10; Heb. ix. 2; cf. Ael. anim. 7, 29; Theophr. char. 25 (16); Thuc. 5, 72; Xen. C. 7, 5, 41; Mem. 1, 1, 4; Aristot. pol. 3, 5; Isocr. Demon. p. 1 and 12; permut. 738; D. S. 1, 69; 4, 46; Lucian. fug. 4; Arrian. Ind. 34, 5, etc. Even in this case, however, if there be no special antithesis Greek authors (according to good Codd.) sometimes omit the Article; see Poppo, Thuc. I. 196 sq.; III. I. 395; Geel, Dion. Chr. Ol. p. 295; cf. Xen. M. 1, 1, 19 τὰ τε λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα (where, as an antithesis to these two participles, immediately follows καὶ τὰ συγῇ βουλευόμενα) Thuc. 5, 37; Plat. rep. 6, 510 c. and Phaed. 123 78 b.; Dion. H. IV. 2242, 2; Diod. S. 1, 50; 2, 30; Arrian. Ind. 7th ed. 5, 1; Dio Chr. 7, 119; Mr. Ant. 5, 1. Cf. also Mtth. 715.

When the influence of a *disjunctive* particle comes in, the repetition of the Article is obviously necessary; as, Luke xi. 51 μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου, Matt. xxiii. 35; 1 Cor. xiv. 7 πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον ἢ τὸ καθαριζόμενον; Matt. x. 14; xvii. 25; xxiii. 17, 19; Mark xiii. 32; Luke xiii. 15; xxii. 27; Jno. iii. 19; Acts xxviii. 17; Rom. iv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Cf. Isocr. permut. 118 p. 746. 6th ed.

b. When the first noun is followed by a Gen., and the second, therefore, is appended to an independent group; as, 1 Cor. i. 28 τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενήμενα, v. 10.

If each of the connected nouns has its Genitive, the repetition of the Article before the second noun is unnecessary, since the two nouns are separated without it; as, Phil. i. 19 διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δέησεως καὶ ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος, etc.

Note 1. Variants occur in a very great number of passages, e.g. Matt. xxvii. 3; Mark viii. 31; x. 33; xi. 15; Luke xxii. 4; Acts xvi. 19; Rom. iv. 2, 11, 19; 1 Cor. xi. 27; 1 Thess. i. 8.

¹ We find the Article both used and omitted before nouns of the same gender in Arrian. Epict. 1, 18, 6 τὴν ὕψιν τὴν διακριτικὴν τῶν λευκῶν καὶ μελάνων . . . τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν κακῶν. Somewhat differently in Acts vi. 9 τινὲς τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερτίνων καὶ Κυρην. καὶ Ἀλεξανδρ., καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας, where Κυρην. and Ἀλεξ. combined with Λιβερτ. constitute one party (with a synagogue in common), as the other synagogue corporation was formed of the Asiatic and Cilician Jews.

Moreover, the view taken of the mutual relation of the connected nouns
 142 may frequently be a matter of indifference; it depends upon the writer how he will regard it; (in 1 Thess. i. 7 we find ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ but in 8 καὶ Ἀχαΐᾳ). Hence there are passages where the reader would not miss the Article, e.g. 1 Tim. v. 5;¹ while in others it might perhaps be used, as in Eph. ii. 20 (Mey. in l.). See in general, Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 253; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 395.

In Tit. ii. 13 ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρ., for reasons which lie in the doctrinal system of Paul, I do not regard σωτῆρος as a second predicate by the side of θεοῦ, as if Christ were first styled ὁ μέγας θεός and then σωτῆρ. The Article is omitted before σωτῆρος, because the word is made definite by the Genitive ἡμῶν, and the apposition precedes the proper name: *of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*²

Similar is 2 Pet. i. 1, where there is not even a pronoun with σωτῆρος. So
 124 also in Jude 4 two different subjects may be referred to, since κύριος, as
 7th ed. made definite by ἡμῶν, does not require the Article in order to mean Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὃς ἐστὶ κύριος ἡμῶν. (In 2 Thess. i. 12 we have simply an instance of κύριος for ὁ κύριος.)

119 Note 2. The omission of the Article in Luke x. 29 τίς ἐστί μου πλησίον,
 7th ed. and 36 τίς τούτων . . . πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπ., seems strange, as one would have expected ὁ πλησίον (see Markland, Eur. Suppl. 110), since, moreover, πλησίον is an adverb. A similar instance has been quoted by Döderlein (Synon. I. 59) from Aeschyl. Prom. 938 ἐμοὶ δ' ἔλασσον Ζηρὸς ἢ μηδὲν μέλλει, where μηδέν appears to be put for τοῦ μηδέν. In both the passages from Luke, however, the adverb also is allowable: *who is near me?* See Bornem. in l.

¹ As the words run: *προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσι καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς*, prayer is distributed into its two kinds; without the repetition of the Article, prayer and petitions would be blended into one.

² In the above remarks I did not mean to deny that σωτῆρος ἡμῶν can grammatically be regarded as a second predicate dependent on the Article τοῦ; only, doctrinal conviction, deduced from Paul's teaching, that this apostle could not have called Christ *the great God*, induced me to show that there is also no grammatical obstacle to taking καὶ σωτ. . . Χριστοῦ by itself as a second subject. Since the anonymous writer in *Tholuck's Liter. Anzeiger* (as referred to) has not proved that, according to my acceptance of the passage the Article *must* have been repeated before σωτῆρος (the passages quoted as parallel are not analogous, see *Fr. Rom.* II. 268), still less that to introduce Christ as ὁ μέγας θεός is in harmony with Paul's representation of the relation of Christ to God, I adhere to the above interpretation. Examples, such as those quoted § 19, 2, will at once satisfy the impartial inquirer that the Article was *not* necessary before σωτῆρος; and the fact that *elsewhere* σωτῆρ is applied also to God, is nothing to the purpose. Enough that σωτῆρ ἡμῶν *our Saviour* is a perfectly definite predicate, just as *his face* is; *πρόσωπον* is applicable to a far greater number of individuals than σωτῆρ. The words S. 38: *If the expression σωτῆρ ἡμῶν invariably occurred in the N. T. of a single definite individual only etc.* contain an arbitrary assumption. *Matthies* has contributed to the discussion nothing decisive.

§ 20. ARTICULUS PRAEPOSITIVUS, b. WITH ATTRIBUTIVES.

1. Attributives (Adjectives, Genitives, or Adjuncts formed with Prepositions¹) annexed to a noun which has the Article, are placed either

a. Between the Article and the noun, as *ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος* Matt. xii. 35, *τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα* Matt. xviii. 20, *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία* 1 Pet. iii. 20, *ἡ ἄνω κλήσις* Phil. iii. 14, *ἡ ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνῇ ἀναστροφή* 1 Pet. iii. 2, *ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη* Rom. xi. 27, *ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις* ix. 11, *τὸ καινὸν αὐτοῦ μνημεῖον* Matt. xxvii. 60; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 7; Heb. v. 14; vi. 7. Or,

b. After the noun; in which case

a. If they are adjectives,² or adjuncts with prepositions, they uniformly take the repeated Article, but

β. If Genitives of nouns, they usually take it only *aa.* when these additions are to be strengthened, or to be made more prominent (1 Cor. i. 18 *ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ*, Tit. ii. 10 *τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*; see Schaef. Melet. p. 8, 72 sq.; Mtth. 727),³ particularly when relationship is added for *distinction's* sake, as Jno. xix. 25 *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ*,⁴ Acts xiii. 22 *Δαβὶδ ὁ τοῦ Ἰεσσαί*,

¹ Genitives of personal pronouns are joined to nouns, as is well known, without the aid of the Article, as *ὁ παῖς μου*. They blend, as it were, with the substantive.

² It is obvious that this applies only to adjectives used as attributives to substantives. In Luke xxiii. 45 *ἐσχίσθη τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον*, the word *μέσον* belongs to the verb: *was rent . . . in the middle*; *τὸ μέσον καταπέτασμα* would have a different meaning. So the similar adjectives of space or number *ἐσχατος*, *ὅλος*, *μόνος*, *ὅλγος* always appear without the Article when they are not really epithets, — either a. *after* the noun, as Matt. xvi. 26 *ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ* if he gain the whole world (the world wholly), x. 30 *αἱ τριχες τ. κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἠριθμημέναι εἰσὶν* (ix. 35; Jno. v. 22; Plato, epin. 983 a.), Matt. xii. 4 *οὐκ ἐξὲν ἦν φαγεῖν . . . εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις*; or b. *before* it, Matt. iv. 23; Heb. ix. 7 *μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς*, Jno. vi. 22; see Geradorf, I. 371 ff., who has collected examples with little judgment. Cf. Jacob, Lucian. Al. p. 51; Krü. 104 f.; Rost, S. 435.

³ Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 55; Mdv. p. 12. This construction, however, gradually lost its force, and many authors almost invariably put the Article before such a Genitive even when no emphasis is intended. So, in particular, Demosth., Isocr. and Xen. Ephes. The orators might have some reason for this in *spoken* discourse. Cf. Siebelis, Pausan. I. 17.

⁴ The precise meaning of the above is: among the women called Mary, the (particular one) of Clopas (the wife of Clopas). The Article is *not* used where the annexed Genitive is not intended to convey any sharp distinction, as Luke vi. 16 *Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου*, Acts i. 13 *Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαιού*, just as Her. 1, 59 *Λυκοῦργος Ἀριστολαίδου* and Dion. H. comp. 1 *Διονυσίου Ἀλεξάνδρου* (in both passages, however, Schaef. would insert the Article), or Aristot. polit. 2, 6 *Ἰππόδαμος Εὐρυφώντος*, and Thuc. 1, 24 *Φάλιος Ἐρατοκλείδου* (Poppo, Thuc. I. 195), *Thilo*, Act. Thom. p. 3; cf. *Hm. Vig.* 701. On the other hand, in Luke xxiv. 10 we must unhesitatingly read, with the most approved MSS., *Μαρία ἡ*

120 Matt. iv. 21; x. 2; Mark iii. 17; ββ. when the noun has already
 7th ed. its (personal) Genitive, as Matt. xxvi. 28 τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς
 διαθήκης, yet the Art. here is not quite established.

c. Rarely such attributives, particularly if adjectives, are put
 before the noun and its Article; as, Acts xxvi. 24 μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ
 ἔφη see above § 18, Matt. iv. 23 περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.

144 In case a. more than one attributive may be inserted between
 the Article and the noun; as, ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἁμωμος ἄνθρωπος. The
 Article then is usually not repeated. With qualifying Genitives
 or adjuncts appended by means of Prepositions, there are instances
 of the repetition of the Article; as, Luke i. 70 διὰ στόματος τῶν
 ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν, 1 Pet. iv. 14 τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ
 θεοῦ πνεῦμα, i.e. *the Spirit of glory and (consequently) the Spirit
 of God*, — the Spirit of glory, which is no other than the Spirit of
 God himself. Similar is Thuc. 1, 126 ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς τῇ μεγίστῃ
 ἑορτῇ, and Plat. rep. 8, 565 d. περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερόν,
 only that καὶ is wanting here.

In case b. also, there is no objection to the accumulation of
 adjuncts, as Heb. xi. 12 ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης, ἡ
 ἀναρθμητος, Rev. ii. 12 τὴν ῥομφαίαν τὴν δίστομον τὴν ὀξεῖαν, Krü.
 102; except that when the last are not connected by καὶ (§ 19, 4)
 the Article must be repeated.¹

It will be necessary to explain here more minutely, and to con-
 firm by examples, the case b. a.

126 a. Adjectives and possessive pronouns with the Article are
 7th ed. placed after the noun, either

Quite alone, as Jno. x. 11 ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός, Acts xii. 10 ἐπὶ τὴν
 πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν, Jno. vii. 6 ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός, i. 9; iv. 11; xv. 1;
 Luke ii. 17; iii. 22; viii. 8; Acts xix. 16; Eph. vi. 13; Col. i. 21;
 2 Tim. iv. 7; 1 Cor. vii. 14; xii. 2, 31; 1 Jno. i. 3; Jas. i. 9; iii. 7
 (in which case the adjective sometimes is subjoined for greater
 perspicuity, cf. particularly Jas. iii. 7, sometimes is to be made
 more emphatic, Bornem. Luc. p. xxxvi.; Mdv. 11). Or

When the governing noun is amplified by a Gen. or in some
 other way, as Matt. iii. 17 ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 2 Cor. vi. 7 διὰ
 τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν, Jno. vi. 13 τῶν
 πέντε ἄρτων τῶν κριθίνων, Matt. vi. 6; Luke vii. 47; Tit. ii. 11;

¹ Ἰακώβου. In general cf. Fr. Mr. p. 696 sq. The collocation of words in Pausan. 2.
 22, 6 τῆς Φορῶνεως Νίδης does not occur in the N. T.

¹ A rare repetition of the Article, in accordance with the above rules, occurs in Rev.
 xxi. 9 ἦλθεν εἰς ἐκ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἔχόντων τὰς ἐπτὰ φιάλας (τὰς) γεμούσας (τῶν)
 ἐπτὰ πληγῶν τῶν ἐσχάτων.

Heb. xiii. 20, etc. (The N. T. writers liked to avoid the construction τὸν μονογ. θεοῦ υἱὸν as intricate; cf. Jno. iii. 16; 1 Jno. iv. 9.)

In the text. rec. of 1 Jno. v. 20 ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος we find the adj. 121 *without* the Article after the noun. The better Codd., however, 6th ed. omit the Article before ζωὴ also. The common reading in itself considered is by no means to be rejected, as in such cases later writers begin to omit the Article (Bhdy. S. 323),¹ although the examples from Long. past. 1, 16; Heliod. 7, 5; Diod. S. 5, 40 are 145 not quite parallel to that from John. Besides, ζωὴ αἰών. had already come to be regarded as a *single* idea, cf. Jno. iv. 36. In Luke xii. 12, Griesb. and Schott have τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, but Knapp and all recent editors give τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, without noting any variants. In 1 Cor. x. 3; Gal. i. 4 τὸ βρῶμα πνευματικόν and ὁ αἰὼν πονηρός are to be considered as blending together into *one* leading idea; and αὐτό and ἐνεστ., as frequently, have been inserted as epithets between the Article and the Substantive; cf. 1 Pet. i. 18. See also Heb. ix. 1 τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν. With Jno. v. 36 ἐγὼ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μεῖζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου (a predicate: *the* witness that I have is greater than, etc., Rost 435) may be compared Isocr. Philipp. c. 56 τὸ σῶμα θνητὸν ἅπαντες ἔχομεν. Further, cf. Schaef. Plut. V. 30.

b. The Article is used with subjoined amplifications of the principal noun consisting of a noun and preposition: 1 Thess. i. 8 ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, 2 Cor. viii. 4 τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, Jas. i. 1 ταῖς φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διωσπορᾷ, Acts xv. 23 τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν . . . ἀδελφοῖς, τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, xxiv. 5 πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, iii. 16; iv. 2; viii. 1; xi. 22; xxvi. 4, 12, 22; xxvii. 5; Mark iv. 31; xiii. 25; Jno. i. 46; Luke xx. 35; Rom. iv. 11; vii. 5, 10; viii. 39; x. 5; xiv. 19; xv. 26, 31; xvi. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 11 f.; iv. 17; xvi. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 6; vii. 12; ix. 1; xi. 3; Phil. i. 11; iii. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 1; iv. 10; 1 Tim. i. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 1; Eph. i. 15; Rev. xiv. 17; xvi. 12; xix. 14; xx. 13. (Variants occur in Acts xx. 21; Luke v. 7; Jno. xix. 38; Rom. x. 1.) For examples from Arrian (yet the like are to be found in every page of the Greek prose authors) see Ellendt, Arrian 127 A. I. 62. 7th ed.

This mode of annexing an attributive (by bringing it in afterwards), as the more simple, is far more frequent in the N. T. than the insertion of it between the Article and the noun. The LXX.

¹ According to the testimony of good Codd. even the earlier writers in certain cases did the same; cf. *Schneider*, Plat. civ. II. 319, and *Krū.* in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 1838. I. 61.

also, as a slight inspection will show, have regularly observed the use of the Art. in this case.

c. Participles, as attributives, in as far as they have not entirely dropped the notion of time, are not treated in this case altogether like adjectives. They take the Article only when some relation already known or especially noteworthy (*is qui, quippe qui*) is indicated, and consequently the idea expressed by the participle
 146 is to be made more prominent, e.g. 1 Pet. v. 10 ὁ θεὸς . . . ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν . . . ὀλίγον παθόντας, αὐτὸς καταρτίσαι God . . . *who hath called us unto his eternal glory, . . . after that we have suffered a while etc.*, Eph. i. 12 εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον τοὺς προσηλπικότητας ἐν τῷ Χρ. *we, the we who (quippe qui)*
 122 *have hoped* (as those who have hoped), cf. vs. 19; Heb. iv. 3; vi. 18;
 6th ed. Rom. viii. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 10; Jno. i. 12; 1 Jno. v. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10; iv. 5; 1 Pet. i. 3; iii. 5; Jas. iii. 6; Acts xxi. 38; cf. Dion. H. III. 1922; Polyb. 3, 45, 2; 3, 48, 6; Lucian. dial. m. 11, 1 a.

On the other hand, the participle occurs *without* the Article in Acts xxiii. 27 τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλληφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων *hunc virum comprehensum* (who was seized, after he had been seized), 2 Cor. xi. 9 ὑστέρημά μου προσανεπλήρωσαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας *the brethren, after they had arrived*, Acts iii. 26 ἀναστήσας ὁ θεὸς τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτόν, etc., *God, having raised up* (causing to appear) *his Son, sent him*, etc. (on the other hand, Heb. xiii. 20), Rom. ii. 27 κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σέ etc., *if or thereby that it fulfils etc.* Cf. Luke xvi. 14; Jno. iv. 6, 39, 45; 1 Cor. i. 7; xiv. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Heb. x. 2; xii. 23; 1 Pet. i. 12 (Fr. Mt. p. 432; Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 14). So Acts xxi. 8 εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά is to be translated: *qui erat*, as being one of the seven (yet some authorities give τοῦ here, which introduces into the passage a false emphasis), Rom. xvi. 1 cf. Demosth. Con. 728 c. *Εὐξίθεον* τουτουὶ ὄνθ' ἡμῖν συγγενῇ, D. S. 17, 38 ὁ παῖς ὦν ἐξ ἐτῶν, 3, 23 τὸν πίπτοντα καρπὸν ὄντα καλόν, Philostr. Apoll. 7, 16 ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἀνύδρῳ οὔσῃ πρότερον, Thuc. 4, 3; 8, 90; Demosth. Polycl. 710 b.; Isocr. Trap. 870; Lucian. Hermot. 81; dial. m. 10, 9; Alciph. 3, 18; Strabo, 3, 164; Long. 2, 2; Philostr. Her. 3, 4 and Sophist. 1, 23, 1.

In Eph. vi. 16 τὰ βέλη τὰ πεπυρωμένα the Article is not fully established (Lchm. has cancelled it); if it is not genuine, the meaning of the passage is: *the darts, when they burn, or though they burn* (to quench the darts of Satan . . . burning as they are). In 2 Jno. 7 ἐρχόμενον belongs to the

predicate ; and in Gal. iii. 1 Ἰησοῦς Χρ. προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος is 128 to be translated : *Jesus Christ as one who has been crucified* ; cf. 1 Cor. 7th ed. i. 23 ; (otherwise in Matt. xxviii. 5).

The above passage, 1 Pet. v. 10, ὁ θεός, ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς . . . ὀλίγον παθόν-
τας is peculiarly instructive respecting the use and the omission of the Arti-
cle with Participles. Whether the Article is to be used or omitted before
the Participle, depends sometimes on the subjective view of the writer. 147
Rom. viii. 1 τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν etc., with a
comma after Ἰησοῦ, means : *to those who are in Christ Jesus, inasmuch as they*
walk not after the flesh. On the other hand, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν,
with greater prominence of the apposition, means : *to those who are in Christ*
Jesus, as persons who walk not etc., to those who walk not etc. ; cf. Mth. 718. The whole clause, however, μὴ . . . πνεῦμα is undoubtedly spurious.

When a Participle with the Article is subjoined in apposition to a noun,
or put in the Vocative (as if in apposition to σὺ), it sometimes denotes
ridicule or disapprobation, or prominently points out some peculiarity as a
subject of ridicule or disapprobation. Expositors of Greek authors have
frequently attributed to the Article itself a derisive force (*articulus irrisi-*
oni inservit, Valcken. Eur. Phoen. 1637 ; Markland, Eurip. Suppl. 110 ; 123
Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 12, and Apol. p. 70) ; this, however, lies only in 6th ed.
the *thought* and its special prominence (and in speaking may also be con-
veyed by the voice). Here, for instance, may be referred from the N. T.
Rom. ii. 1 τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων, Matt. xxvii. 40 ὁ καταλύων
τὸν ναόν . . . κατὰβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ [Jno. v. 12] etc. See Hm. Eur.
Alcest. 708 ; Mth. 722.

2. To the rule explained under b. there are unquestionable —
indeed, well-nigh standing — exceptions, viz.

When an adjunct (consisting of a noun and preposition) which
in reality forms with the substantive but one leading idea, is to be
linked to the preceding noun simply by the voice, the grammatical
connective of the written language (i.e. the Article) is wanting,
e.g. Col. i. 8 δηλώσας ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι your love
in the Spirit, see Huther, 1 Cor. x. 18 βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ
σάρκα (opp. to Ἰσρ. κατὰ πνεῦμα), 2 Cor. vii. 7 τὸν ὑμῶν ζῆλον ὑπὲρ
ἐμοῦ, Eph. ii. 11. This takes place especially,

a. In the oft-recurring apostolic (Pauline) phrase, ἐν Χριστῷ
Ἰησοῦ, or ἐν κυρίῳ, or κατὰ σάρκα, as Col. i. 4 ἀκούσαντες τὴν πί-
στιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Eph.
i. 15 ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰ. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην
τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Rom. ix. 3 τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα,
1 Thess. iv. 16 οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον *the dead*
in Christ (1 Cor. xv. 18), with which in vs. 17 is contrasted ἡμεῖς
οἱ ζῶντες, for these are ζῶντες ἐν Χριστῷ (of the resurrection of

the noun more nearly ; as, Acts xii. 10 διελθόντες πρώτην φυλακὴν καὶ δευτέραν, Mark xv. 25 ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, xv. 138 33 ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης, Luke iii. 1 ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας etc., 2 Cor. xii. 2 ; Eph. vi. 2 (Phil. i. 5 var.) ; cf. from Greek authors Lysias 7, 10 τρίτῳ ἔτει, Plato, Min. 319 c. and Hipp. maj. 286 b. ; Antiph. 6, 42 ; Andoc. 4, 17 ; Diog. L. 7, 135, 138, 141 sqq. (but 7, 150, 151, 153). See above, 1. a. under ὥρα, p. 124.

By this usage may be defended also Matt. xii. 24 ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβοὺλ, ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων, the reading found in all MSS. Fr. (ad Mt. p. 774), without the authority of MSS., substituted ἐν Β. τῷ ἄρχ. etc., as he deemed this omission of the Article strange.

In Greek authors such omission of the Article, especially when the noun is preceded by a preposition, is by no means rare ; cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 13 περὶ καταλύσεως τῆς στρατιᾶς, Apol. Socr. 30 ἐν καταλύσει τοῦ βίου, Mem. 120 1, 5, 2 ἐπὶ τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου, 4, 3, 16 ; Plat. Phaedr. 237 c. ; Lys. Agorat. 2 7th ed. ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου τοῦ ἡμετέρου, and further on πατρίδα σφετέραν αὐτῶν 115 καταλιπόντες, Lucian. Scyth. 4 βίον αὐτῶν, Dio Chr. 38, 471 ὑπὲρ γενέσεως 6th ed. αὐτῆς, Strabo 15, 719 ὑπὸ μήκους τῶν ὁδῶν (17, 808), Thuc. 2, 38 διὰ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως, 7, 72. So in German, also, the Article is usually omitted after a preposition, e.g. über Auflösung des Räthfels etc. In Greek authors, however, in such cases even the Gen. is frequently anarthrous, or if not, it *precedes* ; as, τῶν χωρίων χαλεπότης ; cf. Krü. Dion. H. p. 168 ; Jacobs, Athen. p. 18 sq. ; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 130. (Xen. C. 8, 6, 16 ; Mem. 1, 4, 12 ; Thuc. 1, 1 ; 6, 34 ; 8, 68).

3. c. When several consecutive nouns¹ connected by καὶ and denoting different objects² agree in case and number, each of them regularly takes the Article if they *differ* in gender ; — not merely when they signify persons, as Acts xiii. 50 τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας . . . καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως (Luke xiv. 26 ; Eph. vi. 2 ; Acts xxvi. 30), but also inanimate objects Col. iv. 1 τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε, Rom. viii. 2 ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, Matt. xxii. 4 ; Luke x. 21 ; Rom. xvi. 17 ; Phil. iv. 7 ; 1 Cor. ii. 4 ; Eph. ii. 1 ; Rev. i. 2 ; xiv. 7 ; Heb. iii. 6 ; cf. Xen. C. 2, 2, 9 σὺν τῷ θώρακι κ. τῇ κοπιδί, Plut. virt. mul. p. 210 διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα κ. τὴν ἀρετὴν, Dion. H. IV. 2245, 4 ἐπὶ τοῦ τόκου καὶ

¹ Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 290 sqq., has collected much from Isocrates on the repetition and the non-repetition of the Article with connected nouns (Subst. Adject. Particip. also Infin.), but without throwing entire light on the subject. Cf. also Tholuck, Literar. Anzeig. 1837, No. 5.

² For a repetition of the Article is not admissible before connected nouns which, for instance, are merely predicates of one and the same person, as in Col. iii. 17 τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, 2 Pet. i. 11 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ. Χρ., Eph. vi. 21 ; Mark vi. 3 ; Acts iii. 14.

τῆς λοχείας, 2117, 17 τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ τὰ ὅπλα, 2089, 14; D. S. 1, 50, 51, 86; Philostr. her. 3, 2; Diog. L. 3, 18; 5, 51; Herod. 2, 10, 15; Strabo 3, 163; 15, 712; Plutarch. aud. poet. 9 in. and Themist. 8; Isocr. Areop. p. 334; Plat. Charm. p. 160 b.; Sext. Emp. adv. 139 Math. 2, 58.

In these connections the repetition of the Article appeared *grammatically* necessary, while at the same time the ideas connected are mostly such as require to be grasped separately. See under 4.

Where, however, the ideas do not require to be sharply distinguished, or where an adjective is joined to the first noun and to be extended also to the second, the repetition of the Article does not take place even when the nouns differ in gender; and the *one* Article that precedes serves alike for all the nouns that follow; as, Col. ii. 22 τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Luke xiv. 23 ἐξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς, i. 6 ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαίωμασι τοῦ κυρίου, Mark xii. 33; Rev. v. 12.

Such passages are to be found likewise in Greek authors, — and 121 far more frequently indeed, — in poetry (Hm. Eurip. Hec. p. 76) ^{7th ed.} as well as in prose, without any very precise reference to the sense, e.g. Plat. rep. 9.586 d. τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ λόγῳ, legg. 6, 784 ὁ σωφρονῶν 116 καὶ σωφρονοῦσα, 6. 510 c.; apol. 18 a.; Crat. 405 d.; Aristot. anal. ^{6th ed.} post. 1, 26; Thuc. 1, 54; Lycurg. 30; Lucian. parasit. 13; Herod. 8, 6, 11; Ael. anim. 5, 26; cf. also Krü. Dion. p. 140, and Xen. Anab. p. 92, Bornem. Cyrop. p. 668.

When such nouns are disjoined by ἢ, the Article is invariably repeated; as, Matt. xv. 5 τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ, Mark iv. 21 ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην, Rev. xiii. 17.

When the connected nouns differ in number the repetition of the Article is naturally and grammatically almost indispensable; as, Col. ii. 13 ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, Eph. ii. 3 τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν, 1 Tim. v. 23; Tit. ii. 12; Acts xv. 4, 20; xxviii. 17; Matt. v. 17; Rev. ii. 19. Cf. Plato, Crito 47 c. τὴν δόξαν καὶ τοὺς ἐπαίνους, Dion. H. IV. 2238, 1 ὑπὸ τῆς παρθένου καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν γυναικῶν. Yet Xen. A. 2, 1, 7 ἐπιστήμων τῶν περὶ τὰς τάξεις τε καὶ ὀπλομαχίαν, Agath. 14, 12 τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ πόλεμον. But 1 Cor. iv. 9 θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις does not come under this head; the last two nouns without the Art. particularize the τῷ κόσμῳ: *the world*, — *angels as well as men*.

4. d. If, however, such nouns connected by καὶ are of the *same* gender, the Article is *omitted*

1) When the connected nouns are regarded as only parts of one whole, or members of one community (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex.

p. 253 ; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 455) ; as, Mark xv. 1 *συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων* 140 (where the elders and scribes are designated as only *one* class of individuals, in distinction from the high priests), Luke xiv. 3, 21 ; Col. ii. 8, 19 ; Eph. ii. 20 ; v. 5 ; Phil. i. 7 ; ii. 17 ; Acts xxiii. 7 ; 2 Pet. i. 10 (Xen. A. 2, 2, 5 ; 3, 1, 29 ; Plat. Phil. 28 e. ; Dion. H. IV. 2235, 5 ; Plutarch. aud. poet. 1 in. 12 in.).

2) When between the first noun and its Article a Gen. or some other attributive intervenes, which also qualifies the second ; as, 1 Thess. ii. 12 *εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν*, iii. 7 *ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει καὶ ἀνάγκῃ ἡμῶν*, Rom. i. 20 *ἣ τε αἰδὶος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης*, Phil. i. 25 ; Eph. iii. 5. Cf. Dion. H. IV. 2246, 9 *τὰς αὐτῶν γυναῖκας καὶ θυγατέρας*, 2089, 4 ; D. S. 1, 86 *τὴν προειρημένην ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τιμὴν*, 2, 18 ; Ael. anim. 7, 29 ; Aristot. eth. Nicom. 4, 1, 9 ; 7, 7, 1.¹ So also when the common Genitive follows the second noun ; as, Phil. i. 20 *κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα* 122 *μου*, i. 7 *ἐν τῇ ἀπολογία κ. βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, 1 Pet. ii. 25 7th ed. (on Phil. i. 19 see Mey.). Cf. Benseler p. 293 sq.

Under 1. it should be noted, that in a series of nouns forming a *single* category, only the first has the Article ; as, Acts xxi. 25 *φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς . . . τὸ αἷμα καὶ πνικτὸν καὶ πορνείαν*, Eph. iii. 18 *τί τὸ πλάτος κ. μήκος κ. βάθος* 117 *κ. ὕψος*, Jno. v. 3 ; 1 Cor. v. 10 ; cf. Her. 4, 71 *θάπτονσι καὶ τὸν οἰνοχόον κ. μάγειρον κ. ἵπποκόμον κ. διήκονον κ. ἀγγελιηφόρον*, etc. ; Plato, Euthyph. p. 7 c. For instances with proper names, see Acts i. 13 ; xv. 23.

5. On the other hand, the Article is *used* in the case under consideration, commonly

a. When each of the connected nouns is to be regarded as independent (Schaeff. Dem. V. 501 ; Weber, Dem. 268), 1 Cor. iii. 8 *ὁ φυτεύων καὶ ὁ ποτίζων ἓν εἰσιν*, Acts xxvi. 30 *ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμὼν*, etc., Mark ii. 16 *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* (two separate classes of Christ's adversaries combined for one object), Jno. xix. 6 *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται* *the high priests and the* (subordinate) *attendants* (with their attendants), ii. 14 ; xi. 47 ; Mark ii. 18 ; vi. 21 ; xi. 9, 18, 27 ; xii. 13 ; xiii. 17 ; xiv. 43 ; Luke i. 58 ; viii. 24 ; xi. 39, 42 ; xii. 11 ; xv. 6, 9 ; xx. 20 ; xxi. 23 ; xxiii. 4 ; Acts iv. 23 ; vi. 4, 13 ; xiii. 43 ; xv. 6 ; xxiii. 14 ; xxv. 15 ; Rom. vi. 19 ; Eph. iii. 10, 12 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 2 ; Phil. iv. 6 ; 1 Tim. iv. 6 ; Jas. iii. 11 ; 1 Jno. ii. 22, 24 ; iv. 6 ; v. 6 ; Rev. vi. 15 ; vii. 12 ; xiii. 10, 16 ; xxii. 1 ; cf. Xen. athen. 1, 4 ; Lys. Agorat. 2 ;

¹ In this case, even when the nouns are of different gender, as in Lysias in Andoc. 17 *περὶ τὰ ἀλλότρια ἱερὰ καὶ ἱερὰς ἡσέβει*. Cf. above, 3.

adv. Nicom. 3; Isocr. Areop. p. 352; permut. 736; D. S. 1, 30 141 (διὰ τὴν ἀνδρίαν καὶ τὴν σπάνιν τῆς ἀπάσης τροφῆς) 3, 48; 5, 29; 17, 52; Plut. virt. mul. p. 214 ἔπεμψε τὴν γυναῖκα κ. τὴν θυγατέρα, Ael. anim. 7, 29; Diog. L. 5, 52;¹ Weber, Demosth. p. 395.

So especially when the two nouns are connected by τε . . . καὶ or καὶ . . . καὶ, and thus more prominently exhibited as independent (Schaefer. Demosth. III. 255; IV. 68) Luke xxiii. 12; Acts v. 24; xvii. 10, 14; xviii. 5; Phil. iii. 10; Heb. ix. 2; cf. Ael. anim. 7, 29; Theophr. char. 25 (16); Thuc. 5, 72; Xen. C. 7, 5, 41; Mem. 1, 1, 4; Aristot. pol. 3, 5; Isocr. Demon. p. 1 and 12; permut. 738; D. S. 1, 69; 4, 46; Lucian. fug. 4; Arrian. Ind. 34, 5, etc. Even in this case, however, if there be no special antithesis Greek authors (according to good Codd.) sometimes omit the Article; see Poppo, Thuc. I. 196 sq.; III. I. 395; Geel, Dion. Chr. Ol. p. 295; cf. Xen. M. 1, 1, 19 τὰ τε λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα (where, as an antithesis to these two participles, immediately follows καὶ τὰ συγῇ βουλευόμενα) Thuc. 5, 37; Plat. rep. 6, 510 c. and Phaed. 123 78 b.; Dion. H. IV. 2242, 2; Diod. S. 1, 50; 2, 30; Arrian. Ind. 7th ed. 5, 1; Dio Chr. 7, 119; Mr. Ant. 5, 1. Cf. also Mtth. 715.

When the influence of a *disjunctive* particle comes in, the repetition of the Article is obviously necessary; as, Luke xi. 51 μεταξύ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου, Matt. xxiii. 35; 1 Cor. xiv. 7 πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον ἢ τὸ καθαρίζμενον; Matt. x. 14; xvii. 25; xxiii. 17, 19; Mark xiii. 32; Luke xiii. 15; xxii. 27; Jno. iii. 19; Acts xxviii. 17; Rom. iv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Cf. Isocr. permut. 118 p. 746. 6th ed.

b. When the first noun is followed by a Gen., and the second, therefore, is appended to an independent group; as, 1 Cor. i. 28 τὰ ἀγενή τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενήμενα, v. 10.

If each of the connected nouns has its Genitive, the repetition of the Article before the second noun is unnecessary, since the two nouns are separated without it; as, Phil. i. 19 διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δειξέως καὶ ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος, etc.

Note 1. Variants occur in a very great number of passages, e.g. Matt. xxvii. 3; Mark viii. 31; x. 33; xi. 15; Luke xxii. 4; Acts xvi. 19; Rom. iv. 2, 11, 19; 1 Cor. xi. 27; 1 Thess. i. 8.

¹ We find the Article both used and omitted before nouns of the same gender in Arrian. Epict. 1, 18, 6 τὴν ὕψιν τὴν διακριτικὴν τῶν λευκῶν καὶ μελάνων . . . τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν κακῶν. Somewhat differently in Acts vi. 9 τινὲς τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερτίων καὶ Κυρην. καὶ Ἀλεξανδρ., καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας, where Κυρην. and Ἀλεξ. combined with Λιβερτ. constitute one party (with a synagogue in common), as the other synagogue corporation was formed of the Asiatic and Cilician Jews.

Moreover, the view taken of the mutual relation of the connected nouns
 142 may frequently be a matter of indifference; it depends upon the writer how he will regard it; (in 1 Thess. i. 7 we find ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ but in 8 καὶ Ἀχαΐᾳ). Hence there are passages where the reader would not miss the Article, e.g. 1 Tim. v. 5;¹ while in others it might perhaps be used, as in Eph. ii. 20 (Mey. in l.). See in general, Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 253; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 395.

In Tit. ii. 13 ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρ., for reasons which lie in the doctrinal system of Paul, I do not regard σωτῆρος as a second predicate by the side of θεοῦ, as if Christ were first styled ὁ μέγας θεός and then σωτήρ. The Article is omitted before σωτῆρος, because the word is made definite by the Genitive ἡμῶν, and the apposition precedes the proper name: *of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*²

Similar is 2 Pet. i. 1, where there is not even a pronoun with σωτῆρος. So
 124 also in Jude 4 two different subjects may be referred to, since κύριος, as
 7th ed. made definite by ἡμῶν, does not require the Article in order to mean Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὃς ἐστὶ κύριος ἡμῶν. (In 2 Thess. i. 12 we have simply an instance of κύριος for ὁ κύριος.)

119 Note 2. The omission of the Article in Luke x. 29 τίς ἐστὶ μου πλησίον,
 6th ed. and 36 τίς τούτων . . . πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγενῆσθαι τοῦ ἐμπ., seems strange, as one would have expected ὁ πλησίον (see Markland, Eur. Suppl. 110), since, moreover, πλησίον is an adverb. A similar instance has been quoted by Döderlein (Synon. I. 59) from Aeschyl. Prom. 938 ἐμοὶ δ' Ἰλασσον Ζηνὸς ἢ μηδὲν μέλλει, where μηδέν appears to be put for τοῦ μηδέν. In both the passages from Luke, however, the adverb also is allowable: *who is near me?* See Bornem. in l.

¹ As the words run: προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσι καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, prayer is distributed into its two kinds; without the repetition of the Article, prayer and petitions would be blended into one.

² In the above remarks I did not mean to deny that σωτῆρος ἡμῶν can grammatically be regarded as a second predicate dependent on the Article τοῦ; only, doctrinal conviction, deduced from Paul's teaching, that this apostle could not have called Christ *the great God*, induced me to show that there is also no grammatical obstacle to taking καὶ σωτ. . . . Χριστοῦ by itself as a second subject. Since the anonymous writer in *Tholuck's Liter. Anzeiger* (as referred to) has not proved that, according to my acceptance of the passage the Article *must* have been repeated before σωτῆρος (the passages quoted as parallel are not analogous, see *Fr. Rom.* II. 268), still less that to introduce Christ as ὁ μέγας θεός is in harmony with Paul's representation of the relation of Christ to God, I adhere to the above interpretation. Examples, such as those quoted § 19, 2, will at once satisfy the impartial inquirer that the Article was not necessary before σωτῆρος; and the fact that *elsewhere σωτήρ* is applied also to God, is nothing to the purpose. Enough that σωτήρ ἡμῶν *our Saviour* is a perfectly definite predicate, just as *his face* is; πρόσωπον is applicable to a far greater number of individuals than σωτήρ. The words S. 38: *If the expression σωτήρ ἡμῶν invariably occurred in the N. T. of a single definite individual only etc.* contain an arbitrary assumption. *Matthies* has contributed to the discussion nothing decisive.

§ 20. ARTICULUS PRAEPOSITIVUS, b. WITH ATTRIBUTIVES.

1. Attributives (Adjectives, Genitives, or Adjuncts formed with Prepositions¹) annexed to a noun which has the Article, are placed either

a. Between the Article and the noun, as *ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος* Matt. xii. 35, *τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα* Matt. xviii. 20, *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*, *ἡ τοῦ 143 θεοῦ μακροθυμία* 1 Pet. iii. 20, *ἡ ἄνω κλήσις* Phil. iii. 14, *ἡ ἐν φόβῳ ὀγνῇ ἀναστροφή* 1 Pet. iii. 2, *ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη* Rom. xi. 27, *ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις* ix. 11, *τὸ καινὸν αὐτοῦ μνημεῖον* Matt. xxvii. 60; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 7; Heb. v. 14; vi. 7. Or,

b. After the noun; in which case

a. If they are adjectives,² or adjuncts with prepositions, they uniformly take the repeated Article, but

β. If Genitives of nouns, they usually take it only *aa.* when these additions are to be strengthened, or to be made more prominent (1 Cor. i. 18 *ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ*, Tit. ii. 10 *τὴν διδασκαλίαν* ^{7th ed.} *τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*; see Schaef. Melet. p. 8, 72 sq.; Mtth. 727),³ particularly when relationship is added for *distinction's* sake, as Jno. xix. 25 *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ*,⁴ Acts xiii. 22 *Δαβὶδ ὁ τοῦ Ἰεσοῦ*,

¹ Genitives of personal pronouns are joined to nouns, as is well known, without the aid of the Article, as *ὁ παῖς μου*. They blend, as it were, with the substantive.

² It is obvious that this applies only to adjectives used as attributives to substantives. *ἡν* Luke xxiii. 45 *ἐσχίσθη τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον*, the word *μέσον* belongs to the verb: *was rent . . . in the middle*; *τὸ μέσον καταπέτασμα* would have a different meaning. So the similar adjectives of space or number *ἐσχατος*, *ὅλος*, *μόνος*, *ὅλγος* always appear without the Article when they are not really epithets, — either a. *after* the noun, as Matt. xvi. 26 *ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ* if he gain the whole world (the world wholly), x. 30 *αἱ τρίχες τ. κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἡριθμημέναι εἰσὶν* (ix. 35; Jno. v. 22; Plato, epin. 983 a.), Matt. xii. 4 *οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν φαγεῖν . . . εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις*; or b. *before* it, Matt. iv. 23; Heb. ix. 7 *μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς*, Jno. vi. 22; see Geradorf, I. 371 ff., who has collected examples with little judgment. Cf. Jacob, Lucian. Al. p. 51; Krü. 104 f.; Roet, S. 435.

³ Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 55; Mdv. p. 12. This construction, however, gradually lost its force, and many authors almost invariably put the Article before such a Genitive even when no emphasis is intended. So, in particular, Demosth., Isocr. and Xen. Ephes. The orators might have some reason for this in *spoken* discourse. Cf. Siebelis, Pausan. I. 17.

⁴ The precise meaning of the above is: among the women called Mary, the (particular one) of Clopas (the wife of Clopas). The Article is *not* used where the annexed Genitive is not intended to convey any sharp distinction, as Luke vi. 16 *Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου*, Acts i. 13 *Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαιού*, just as Her. 1, 59 *Λυκούργος Ἀριστολαΐδου* and Dion. H. comp. 1 *Διονυσίου Ἀλεξάνδρου* (in both passages, however, Schaef. would insert the Article), or Aristot. polit. 2, 6 *Ἰππόδαμος Εὐρυφώντος*, and Thuc. 1, 24 *Φάλιος Ἐρατοκλείδου* (Poppo, Thuc. I. 195), *Thilo*, Act. Thom. p. 3; cf. *Hm.* Vig. 701. On the other hand, in Luke xxiv. 10 we must unhesitatingly read, with the most approved MSS., *Μαρία ἡ*

120 Matt. iv. 21; x. 2; Mark iii. 17; ββ. when the noun has already
 6th ed. its (personal) Genitive, as Matt. xxvi. 28 τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς
 διαθήκης, yet the Art. here is not quite established.

c. Rarely such attributives, particularly if adjectives, are put
 before the noun and its Article; as, Acts xxvi. 24 μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ
 ἔφη see above § 18, Matt. iv. 23 περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.

144 In case a. more than one attributive may be inserted between
 the Article and the noun; as, ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἄμωμος ἄνθρωπος. The
 Article then is usually not repeated. With qualifying Genitives
 or adjuncts appended by means of Prepositions, there are instances
 of the repetition of the Article; as, Luke i. 70 διὰ στόματος τῶν
 ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν, 1 Pet. iv. 14 τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ
 θεοῦ πνεῦμα, i.e. *the Spirit of glory and* (consequently) *the Spirit*
of God,—the Spirit of glory, which is no other than the Spirit of
 God himself. Similar is Thuc. 1, 126 ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς τῇ μεγίστῃ
 ἑορτῇ, and Plat. rep. 8, 565 d. περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερόν,
 only that καί is wanting here.

In case b. also, there is no objection to the accumulation of
 adjuncts, as Heb. xi. 12 ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χέλος τῆς θαλάσσης, ἡ
 ἀναρίθμητος, Rev. ii. 12 τὴν ῥομφαίαν τὴν δίστομον τὴν ὀξεῖαν, Krü.
 102; except that when the last are not connected by καί (§ 19, 4)
 the Article must be repeated.¹

It will be necessary to explain here more minutely, and to con-
 firm by examples, the case b. a.

126 a. Adjectives and possessive pronouns with the Article are
 7th ed. placed after the noun, either

Quite alone, as Jno. x. 11 ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός, Acts xii. 10 ἐπὶ τὴν
 πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν, Jno. vii. 6 ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός, i. 9; iv. 11; xv. 1;
 Luke ii. 17; iii. 22; viii. 8; Acts xix. 16; Eph. vi. 13; Col. i. 21;
 2 Tim. iv. 7; 1 Cor. vii. 14; xii. 2, 31; 1 Jno. i. 3; Jas. i. 9; iii. 7
 (in which case the adjective sometimes is subjoined for greater
 perspicuity, cf. particularly Jas. iii. 7, sometimes is to be made
 more emphatic, Bornem. Luc. p. xxxvi.; Mdv. 11). Or

When the governing noun is amplified by a Gen. or in some
 other way, as Matt. iii. 17 ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 2 Cor. vi. 7 διὰ
 τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν, Jno. vi. 13 τῶν
 πέντε ἄρτων τῶν κριθίνων, Matt. vi. 6; Luke vii. 47; Tit. ii. 11;

¹ Ἰακώβου. In general cf. Fr. Mr. p. 696 sq. The collocation of words in Pausan. 2.
 22, 6 τῆς Φορώνεως Νιδίης does not occur in the N. T.

¹ A rare repetition of the Article, in accordance with the above rules, occurs in Rev.
 xxi. 9 ἦλθεν εἰς ἐκ τῶν ἐπτά ἀγγέλων τῶν ἔχόντων τὰς ἐπτά φιάλας (τὰς) γεμούσας (τῶν)
 ἐπτά πληγῶν τῶν ἐσχάτων.

Heb. xiii. 20, etc. (The N. T. writers liked to avoid the construction τὸν μονογ. θεοῦ υἱὸν as intricate; cf. Jno. iii. 16; 1 Jno. iv. 9.)

In the text. rec. of 1 Jno. v. 20 ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος we find the adj. 121 *without* the Article after the noun. The better Codd., however, omit the Article before ζωὴ also. The common reading in itself considered is by no means to be rejected, as in such cases later writers begin to omit the Article (Bhdy. S. 323),¹ although the examples from Long. past. 1, 16; Heliod. 7, 5; Diod. S. 5, 40 are 145 not quite parallel to that from John. Besides, ζωὴ αἰών. had already come to be regarded as a *single* idea, cf. Jno. iv. 36. In Luke xii. 12, Griesb. and Schott have τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, but Knapp and all recent editors give τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, without noting any variants. In 1 Cor. x. 3; Gal. i. 4 τὸ βρῶμα πνευματικόν and ὁ αἰὼν ποιηρός are to be considered as blending together into *one* leading idea; and αὐτό and ἐνεστ., as frequently, have been inserted as epithets between the Article and the Substantive; cf. 1 Pet. i. 18. See also Heb. ix. 1 τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν. With Jno. v. 36 ἐγὼ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μεῖζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου (a predicate: *the* witness that I have is greater than, etc., Rost 435) may be compared Isocr. Philipp. c. 56 τὸ σῶμα θνητὸν ἅπαντες ἔχομεν. Further, cf. Schaef. Plut. V. 30.

b. The Article is used with subjoined amplifications of the principal noun consisting of a noun and preposition: 1 Thess. i. 8 ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, 2 Cor. viii. 4 τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, Jas. i. 1 ταῖς φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διωσπορᾷ, Acts xv. 23 τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν . . . ἀδελφοῖς, τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, xxiv. 5 πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, iii. 16; iv. 2; viii. 1; xi. 22; xxvi. 4, 12, 22; xxvii. 5; Mark iv. 31; xiii. 25; Jno. i. 46; Luke xx. 35; Rom. iv. 11; vii. 5, 10; viii. 39; x. 5; xiv. 19; xv. 26, 31; xvi. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 11 f.; iv. 17; xvi. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 6; vii. 12; ix. 1; xi. 3; Phil. i. 11; iii. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 1; iv. 10; 1 Tim. i. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 1; Eph. i. 15; Rev. xiv. 17; xvi. 12; xix. 14; xx. 13. (Variants occur in Acts xx. 21; Luke v. 7; Jno. xix. 38; Rom. x. 1.) For examples from Arrian (yet the like are to be found in every page of the Greek prose authors) see Ellendt, Arrian 127 Al. I. 62. 7th ed.

This mode of annexing an attributive (by bringing it in afterwards), as the more simple, is far more frequent in the N. T. than the insertion of it between the Article and the noun. The LXX.

¹ According to the testimony of good Codd. even the earlier writers in certain cases did the same; cf. *Schneider*, Plat. civ. II. 319, and *Krüz.* in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 1838. I. 61.

also, as a slight inspection will show, have regularly observed the use of the Art. in this case.

c. Participles, as attributives, in as far as they have not entirely dropped the notion of time, are not treated in this case altogether like adjectives. They take the Article only when some relation already known or especially noteworthy (*is qui, quippe qui*) is indicated, and consequently the idea expressed by the participle is to be made more prominent, e.g. 1 Pet. v. 10 *ὁ θεὸς . . . ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν . . . ὀλίγον παθόντας, αὐτὸς καταρτίσαι* God . . . *who hath called us unto his eternal glory, . . . after that we have suffered a while etc.*, Eph. i. 12 *εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον τοὺς προσηλπικότητας ἐν τῷ Χρ.* *we, the we who (quippe qui) have hoped* (as those who have hoped), cf. vs. 19; Heb. iv. 3; vi. 18; 122 *ed.* Rom. viii. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 10; Jno. i. 12; 1 Jno. v. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10; iv. 5; 1 Pet. i. 3; iii. 5; Jas. iii. 6; Acts xxi. 38; cf. Dion. H. III. 1922; Polyb. 3, 45, 2; 3, 48, 6; Lucian. dial. m. 11, 1 a.

On the other hand, the participle occurs *without* the Article in Acts xxiii. 27 *τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλληφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* *hunc virum comprehensum* (who was seized, after he had been seized), 2 Cor. xi. 9 *ὑστέρημά μου προσανεπήλωσαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας* *the brethren, after they had arrived*, Acts iii. 26 *ἀναστήσας ὁ θεὸς τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτόν*, etc., God, *having raised up* (causing to appear) *his Son, sent him*, etc. (on the other hand, Heb. xiii. 20), Rom. ii. 27 *κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σέ* etc., *if or thereby that it fulfils* etc. Cf. Luke xvi. 14; Jno. iv. 6, 39, 45; 1 Cor. i. 7; xiv. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Heb. x. 2; xii. 23; 1 Pet. i. 12 (Fr. Mt. p. 432; Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 14). So Acts xxi. 8 *εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά* is to be translated: *qui erat*, as being one of the seven (yet some authorities give *τοῦ* here, which introduces into the passage a false emphasis), Rom. xvi. 1 cf. Demosth. Con. 728 c. *Εὐξίθεον τουτονὶ δυνθ' ἡμῖν συγγενή*, D. S. 17, 38 *ὁ παῖς ὦν ἐξ ἐτῶν*, 3, 23 *τὸν πίπτοντα καρπὸν ὄντα καλόν*, Philostr. Apoll. 7, 16 *ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἀνύδρω οὕση πρότερον*, Thuc. 4, 3; 8, 90; Demosth. Polycl. 710 b.; Isocr. Trap. 870; Lucian. Hermot. 81; dial. m. 10, 9; Alciph. 3, 18; Strabo, 3, 164; Long. 2, 2; Philostr. Her. 3, 4 and Sophist. 1, 23, 1.

In Eph. vi. 16 *τὰ βέλη τὰ πεπυρωμένα* the Article is not fully established (Lchm. has cancelled it); if it is not genuine, the meaning of the passage is: *the darts, when they burn, or though they burn* (to quench the darts of Satan . . . burning as they are). In 2 Jno. 7 *ἐρχόμενον* belongs to the

predicate ; and in Gal. iii. 1 Ἰησοῦς Χρ. προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος is 128
to be translated : *Jesus Christ as one who has been crucified* ; cf. 1 Cor. 7th ed.
i. 23 ; (otherwise in Matt. xxviii. 5).

The above passage, 1 Pet. v. 10, ὁ θεός, ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς . . . ὀλίγον παθόν-
τας is peculiarly instructive respecting the use and the omission of the Arti-
cle with Participles. Whether the Article is to be used or omitted before
the Participle, depends sometimes on the subjective view of the writer. 147
Rom. viii. 1 τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν etc., with a
comma after Ἰησοῦ, means : *to those who are in Christ Jesus, inasmuch as they*
walk not after the flesh. On the other hand, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν,
with greater prominence of the apposition, means : *to those who are in Christ*
Jesus, as persons who walk not etc., to those who walk not etc. ; cf. Mth.
718. The whole clause, however, μὴ . . . πνεῦμα is undoubtedly spurious.

When a Participle with the Article is subjoined in apposition to a noun,
or put in the Vocative (as if in apposition to σὺ), it sometimes denotes
ridicule or disapprobation, or prominently points out some peculiarity as a
subject of ridicule or disapprobation. Expositors of Greek authors have
frequently attributed to the Article itself a derisive force (*articulus irrisi-*
oni inservit, Valcken. Eur. Phoen. 1637 ; Markland, Eurip. Suppl. 110 ; 123
Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 12, and Apol. p. 70) ; this, however, lies only in 8th ed.
the *thought* and its special prominence (and in speaking may also be con-
veyed by the voice). Here, for instance, may be referred from the N. T.
Rom. ii. 1 τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων, Matt. xxvii. 40 ὁ καταλύων
τὸν ναόν . . . κατὰβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ [Jno. v. 12] etc. See Hm. Eur.
Alcest. 708 ; Mth. 722.

2. To the rule explained under b. there are unquestionable —
indeed, well-nigh standing — exceptions, viz.

When an adjunct (consisting of a noun and preposition) which
in reality forms with the substantive but one leading idea, is to be
linked to the preceding noun simply by the voice, the grammatical
connective of the written language (i.e. the Article) is wanting,
e.g. Col. i. 8 δηλώσας ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι your love
in the Spirit, see Huther, 1 Cor. x. 18 βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ
σάρκα (opp. to Ἰσρ. κατὰ πνεῦμα), 2 Cor. vii. 7 τὸν ὑμῶν ζῆλον ὑπὲρ
ἐμοῦ, Eph. ii. 11. This takes place especially,

a. In the oft-recurring apostolic (Pauline) phrase, ἐν Χριστῷ
Ἰησοῦ, or ἐν κυρίῳ, or κατὰ σάρκα, as Col. i. 4 ἀκούσαντες τὴν πί-
στιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Eph.
i. 15 ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰ. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην
τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Rom. ix. 3 τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα,
1 Thess. iv. 16 οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον *the dead*
in Christ (1 Cor. xv. 18), with which in vs. 17 is contrasted ἡμεῖς
οἱ ζῶντες, for these are ζῶντες ἐν Χριστῷ (of the resurrection of

non-Christians Paul has here no occasion to speak), Phil. iii. 14; Eph. iv. 1 (where Paul, if ἐν κυρίῳ is to be connected with παρακαλῶ, would have placed this latter word after ὑμᾶς; δέσμος ἐν κυρίῳ 129 gives the proper emphasis to the admonition that follows), ii. 21; 7th ed. vi. 21. Not unlike this is 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ 148 Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ, etc. Likewise in 1 Tim. vi. 17 τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι¹ are to be connected. Cf. besides, Acts xxvi. 4; Rom. xvi. 3, 8, 10; Eph. ii. 15; Phil. i. 1.

b. When the primitive verb was construed with a particular preposition, or when the adjunct is half-implicit in the noun (Held, Plut. Timol. p. 419; Krü. 103), as Eph. iii. 4 δύνασθε νοῦσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ (Josh. i. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Esr. i. 31) cf. Dan. i. 4 συνιέντες ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ; Rom. vi. 4 συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον (vs. 3 ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ), Phil. i. 26 διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς,² 2 Cor. ix. 13 ἀπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας, Col. 124 i. 12 (Job xxx. 19) cf. Bähr in loc.; Eph. iii. 13 ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσί 7th ed. μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (cf. vs. 1), 2 Cor. i. 6; Col. i. 24. So Polyb. 3, 48, 11 τὴν τῶν ὄχλων ἀλλοτριότητα πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, D. S. 17, 10 τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου παρουσίας ἐπὶ τὰς Θήβας, Her. 5, 108 ἡ ἀγγελία περὶ τῶν Σαρδίων, Thuc. 5, 20 ἡ ἐσβολὴ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν 2, 52 ἡ συγκαμὸδὴ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν εἰς τὸ ἄστυ 1, 18; Plutarch. Coriol. 24 ἡ τῶν πατρικίων δυσμένεια πρὸς τὸν δῆμον, and Pomp. 58 αἱ παρακλησεις ὑπὲρ Καίσαρος. From the LXX. compare Exod. xvi. 7 τὸν γογγυσμὸν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ, which Thiersch considers as *raene vitiosum*!

Case a. is to be referred no doubt to the colloquial language, which, having the more expressive aid of the voice, scarcely employed the Article anywhere; whereas the literary language, for the sake of precision, could less easily dispense with it. Yet from the literary language a few instances even of this omission of the Article may be produced; cf. Polyb. 5, 64, 6 διὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς δόξαν ἐκ τῆς ἀθλήσεως, Sext. Emp. hypot. 3, 26 ζητούμεν περὶ τοῦ τόπου πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν for τοῦ πρὸς ἄ., as appears from what precedes, Thuc. 6, 55 ὡς ὅτε βωμὸς σημαίνει καὶ ἡ στήλη περὶ τῆς τῶν τυράννων

¹ According to Paul's view we are likewise probably to take δ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως together in the quotation from the O. T. in Rom. i. 17 and Gal. iii. 11. In the former passage he wishes to establish by the words of the prophet the proposition δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐκ πίστεως etc., and not ἡ ζωὴ ἐκ δικαιοσύνης. Cf. Rom. x. 6 ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη. But in Heb. x. 38 ἐκ πίστεως must undoubtedly be joined to ζῆσεται; see Bleek.

² Accordingly, in Rom. v. 2 there would be no objection in this respect to connecting τῇ πίστει (which however Lehm. and Tdf. have rejected) εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην. There are, however, other difficulties.

ἀδικίας (where Bekker from conjecture has inserted ἡ before περ), cf. Krü. Dion. p. 153; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 234.

In classifying such constructions, however, we must be cautious;¹ many that seem to come under this head we shall find, on closer examination, to be different; cf. Ellendt, Arrian. al. I. 315. 149
130
7th ed.

a) Sometimes, for instance, a slight transposition of the words may have ensued, as 1 Tim. i. 2 Τιμοθέω γνησίω τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει, where the words ἐν πίστει construed according to the sense with γνησίω would mean *genuine in faith*; cf. Xen. A. 4, 3, 23 κατὰ τὰς προσηκούσας ὄχθας ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν, i.e. κατὰ τὰς ἐπὶ τ. π. προσηκ. ὄχθας. For several reasons, however, it is preferable to take ἐν πίστει there as an adjunct to the compound notion, — *genuine child*. On the other hand, in 1 Pet. i. 2 it may be that the qualifying clauses κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ . . . εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμόν etc. should be joined to ἐκλεκτοῖς.

b) Elsewhere the adjunct belongs as a closer limitation directly to the verb, as Col. i. 6 ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (see Bähr and Mey.), Rom. iii. 25 διὰ προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι (see Fr. and de Wette in l.); viii. 2 ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ 'Ι. ἠλευθέρωσέ με ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου where it is evident, partly from the antithesis νόμος τοῦ θανάτου (to which νόμος τῆς ζωῆς correctly corresponds), and partly from vs. 3, that ἐν Χριστῷ must be connected with ἠλευθέρωσε, as Koppe has done; Phil. i. 14 τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν κυρίῳ πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (cf. a similar construction in Gal. v. 10 πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ and 2 Thess. iii. 4), as ἐν κυρίῳ has a real meaning only when joined to πεποιθότας; Jas. iii. 13 δεῖξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν πραύτητι σοφίας, where the words ἐν πραύτητι σοφίας are an explanatory adjunct to ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς. Further, cf. Rom. v. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 7; ix. 18; Phil. iii. 9; iv. 19, 21; Col. i. 9; Eph. ii. 7; iii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 16; Philem. 20; Heb. xiii. 20; Jno. xv. 11, see Lücke; 1 Jno. iv. 17; Jude 21. Likewise in Acts xxii. 18 οὐ παραδέχονται σου τὴν μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ may be translated: *they will not receive concerning me thy testimony*, i.e. in reference to me no testimony from thee; τὴν

¹ Harless on Eph. i. 15 and Mey. on Rom. iii. 25 etc., have taken the same view as the above. Fr. also, who in his letter to Tholuck, S. 35, had declared it a blunder to connect διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, has stated (Rom. I. 195, 365) his altered opinion, and also in Rom. vi. 4 the combination διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, which in p. 32 of his letter he had pronounced grammatically faulty, he has defended as alone admissible.

μαρτυρίαν τὴν περὶ ἐμοῦ would be *thy testimony to be given*, or *given, concerning me*. In Eph. v. 26 ἐν ῥήματι does not belong to τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος, but the passage is probably to be arranged thus : ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ, καθαρίσας τῷ λ. τ. ὕδ., ἐν ῥήματι. The καθαρίζειν 150 precedes the ἀγιάζειν and denotes something negative, as the latter denotes something positive ; see Rück. and Mey. In Heb. x. 10 it was not necessary to write διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος . . . τῆς ἐφάπαξ ; the latter word may just as well be referred to ἡγιασμένοι ; see Bleek. On Eph. ii. 15 and Col. ii. 14 see § 31, note 1, p. 220.

In Eph. vi. 5 for τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα good Codd. have τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, which Lchm. has adopted.

3. An appellative in apposition to a proper name,

131 a. Usually has the Article, e.g. Acts xxv. 13 Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασι-
 7th ed. λεύς, Luke ix. 19 Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, Acts xii. 1 ; xiii. 8 ; xxiii. 24 ; xxvi. 9 ; 2 Cor. xi. 32 ; Matt. xxvii. 2, etc. In such a case the appellative always denotes a dignity, or the like, already known, and thus renders definite the proper name which may be common to many individuals. *Agrippa the king*, is properly that Agrippa who among those called Agrippa is king, etc. Cf. § 18, 6, p. 112 sq.

b. On the other hand, in Acts x. 32 Σίμων βυρσεύς *Simon a tanner* (a certain Simon who was a tanner), Luke ii. 36 Ἄννα προφῆτις *Anna a prophetess*, viii. 3 Ἰωάννα, γυνὴ Χουζᾶ, ἐπιτρόπου Ἑρώδου, Acts xx. 4 Γάιος Δερβαῖος *Gaius of Derbe* (not the already known *Derbaean*), x. 22. In all these instances a predicate in apposition is simply annexed, without any precise intention of distinguishing the person from others of the same name. Likewise in Luke iii. 1 ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος must strictly be translated : *of Tiberius as emperor*. Gersd. p. 167 is incorrect. In Acts vii. 10 ἐναντίον Φαραῶ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου does not mean : *before Pharaoh, the* (known or then) king of Egypt ; but *before Pharaoh king of Egypt*, i.e. before Pharaoh who was king of Egypt. Cf. Plutarch. parallel. 15 Βρέννος Γαλατῶν Βασιλεὺς, c. 30 Ἀτεπόμαρος Γάλλων βασιλεὺς, etc.

With other words in apposition, also, the use or the omission of the Article is determined by the general rule ; and it is strange that any one should assert, in absolute terms, that a word in ap-
 126 position never has the Article. *Your father, an unlearned man*,
 6th ed. would be expressed, to be sure, even in Greek without the Article ; but in the expression, *your father, the field-marshal*, the Article stands with entire propriety. *Grammatically* this applies to Jno.
 151 viii. 44. In general, the use of the Article may be regarded as more common than its omission (Rost 439).

The Article *may* be omitted, in accordance with the principles explained in § 19, even when the intention is to express a characteristic predicate distinctive of the particular individual; as, Rom. i. 7 ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, 1 Tim. i. 1 κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, 1 Pet. v. 8 ὁ ἀντιδικὸς ὑμῶν διάβολος. So also if the appellative predicate precedes the proper name, as κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 3; Phil. iii. 20, etc.; although in the latter case the Article is used for the most part, as 1 Cor. xi. 23 ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς, and 2 Tim. i. 10 τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, Tit. iii. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 11; Philem. 5, etc.

4. A limiting attributive joined to an *anarthrous* noun (appellative), properly dispenses with the Article; as, Matt. vii. 11 δόματα ἀγαθὰ, Jno. ix. 1 εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς, [Matt. ii. 1 μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν *oriental magi*], 1 Tim. iv. 3 ἀ ὁ θεὸς ἐκτίσεν εἰς μετὰληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας, i. 5 ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας, Tit. i. 6 τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας ἢ ἀνυπότακτα, Rom. xiv. 17 δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, cf. Plat. rep. 2, 378 d. "Ἦρας δὲ δεσμοὺς ὑπὸ νείεος καὶ Ἡφαίστου ῥίψεις ^{1b ed} 132 ὑπὸ πατρός, μέλλοντος τῇ μητρὶ τυπτομένη ἀμύνειν, καὶ θεομαχίας, ^{1b ed} 132 ὅσας Ὀμηρος πεποίηκεν, οὐ παραδεκτέον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, Theophr. ch. 29 ἔστι δὲ ἡ κακολογία ὡγὼν τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐν λόγοις, Aelian. anim. 11, 15 ἔοικα λέξειν ἐλέφαντος ὄργην εἰς γάμον ἀδικον μένου.¹ Cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 91, 110, 152; Krü. 101.

Not unfrequently, however, it happens that such attributives are joined to an *anarthrous* noun by means of the Article; and that not merely when the noun belongs to the class specified in § 19, 1 (1 Pet. i. 21), but also in other cases, though never without adequate ground; e.g. 1 Pet. i. 7 τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσοῦ, τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, which is to be resolved: *more precious than gold (that gold) which is perishable*, Acts xxvi. 18 πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ *by faith, namely, the faith in me*, 2 Tim. i. 13 ἐν ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Tit. iii. 5 οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, Rom. ii. 14 ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα *gentiles that have not the law*, see Fr. in l. (compare on the other hand, 1 Thess. iv. 5); ix. 30; Gal. iii. 21 (compare here Liban. oratt. p. 201 b.), Heb. vi. 7; Phil. iii. 9.

In such passages, the noun is first presented to the mind as 152

¹ So κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ might signify a nocturnal thief; but in 1 Thess. v. 2 with ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ ἀνέρχεται is to be supplied from the following clause: that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night (cometh). Even adverbs are joined without the article — that is to say, prefixed — to such *anarthrous* nouns, as μάλα χειμῶν Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 14 a severe winter. See Krü. in Jahn's Jahrb. 1838, I. 57.

127 indefinite,¹ and is then rendered definite by the attributive, whose ^{6th ed.} import receives, by this very construction, special prominence.

See further, Acts x. 41; xix. 11, 17; xxvi. 22; Phil. i. 11; iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 4; iii. 13; iv. 8; 2 Tim. i. 14; ii. 10; Heb. ix. 2; 2 Jno. 7; Jude 4; Jas. i. 25; iv. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1. Cf. Her. 2, 114 *ἐς γῆν τὴν σὴν*, Xen. M. 2, 1, 32 *ἀνθρώποις τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς μεν*, that is *the good*, Hiero 3, 8 *ὑπὸ γυναικῶν τῶν ἑαυτῶν*, Mem. 1, 7, 5; 4, 5, 11; Dign. H. IV. 2219, 4 *εὐνοία τῇ πρὸς αὐτόν*, 2221, 5 *ὀπλισμὸς ὁ τοῖς τηλικούτοις πρέπων*, Aelian. anim. 8, 23 *οὐδὲ ἐπὶ κέρδει τῷ μεγίστῳ*, 7, 27; Her. 5, 18; 6, 104; Plato, rep. 8, 545 a.; legg. 8, 849 b.; Demosth. Neaer. 517 b.; Theophr. ch. 15; Schneid. Isocr. Paneg. c. 24; Arrian. Ind. 34, 1; Xen. Ephes. 2, 5; 4, 3; Heliod. 7, 2; 8, 5; Strabo 7, 302; Lucian. asin. 25, 44; scyth. 1; Philostr. Apoll. 7, 30; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 409; Herm. Lucian. conser. hist. p. 106; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 241; Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 226; Mdv. S. 14.

In Phil. ii. 9 the text. rec. has *ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομα* a name that is above every name. Yet good Codd. [Sin. also] have the Article before *ὄνομα*: *the name* (which he now enjoys), *which* etc., the (known) dignity, which etc.

133
7th ed.
153

CHAPTER II.

PRONOUNS.

§ 21. THE PRONOUNS IN GENERAL.

1. In the use of the Pronouns the language of the N. T. deviates from the earlier prose of the Greeks, or even from Greek usage in general, only in these two particulars: First, it multiplies the personal and demonstrative pronouns for the sake of greater perspicuity (or emphasis) § 22 sqq. Secondly, it neglects—more frequently than do the later Greeks even—many forms which ranked rather among the luxuries of the language, or were not felt by Orientals to be necessary (such as the correlatives *ὅστις*, *ὅπόσος*, *ὅποῖος*, *πηλίκος* in indirect discourse); whereas those modes of expression by which the Greek aimed at conciseness (e.g. attraction), have become very frequent in the N. T. writers

¹ This appears most plainly in sentences like Mark xv. 41 *ἀλλὰ πολλὰ αὶ συναβᾶσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα*.

§ 24. On the other hand it has been erroneously asserted that αὐτός in the N. T. is equivalent to the unemphatic *he*. Further, the Hebraistic distribution of οὐδείς into οὐ . . . πῶς occurs almost exclusively in aphoristic propositions or set phrases.

2. It is a peculiarity common to the Pronouns, whether personal, demonstrative, or relative, that they not unfrequently take a different gender from that of the nouns to which they refer, regard being had to the *meaning* of the nouns, not to their grammatical sex 128 (constructio ad sensum). This happens especially when an *animate* ^{7th ed.} object is denoted by a neuter substantive or a feminine abstract; the Pronoun is then made to agree grammatically with the sex of the object in question, either masc. or fem.; as, Matt. xxviii. 19 μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτούς, Rev. xix. 15 (cf. Exod. xxiii. 27; Deut. iv. 27; xviii. 14, etc.) Rom. ii. 14; Acts xv. 17; xxvi. 17; Gal. iv. 19 τέκνιά μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδάσω, 2 Jno. 1 (similarly Eurip. Suppl. 12 ἑπτὰ γενναίων τέκνων, οὓς, Aristoph. Plut. 292), Jno. vi. 9 ἔστι παιδάριον ἐν ὧδε, ὃς ἔχει, as the majority 154 of better Codd. have for the common reading ὁ, Mark v. 41 (Esth. ii. 9); Col. ii. 15 τὰς ἀρχὰς κ. τ. ἐξουσίας . . . θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς, Col. ii. 19 τὴν κεφαλὴν (Χριστόν), ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα, etc. (Jno. xv. 26 does not come under this head, as πνεῦμα is merely in apposition). For instances from Greek authors, see Mtth. 976; Wurm, Dinarch. 81 sq.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 368; cf. Drakenborch, Liv. 29, 12. There are variants in Rev. iii. 4; xiii. 14, etc.

Under this head comes also Rev. xvii. 16 καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα ἃ εἶδες καὶ 134 τὸ θηρίον, οὗτοι μισήσουσι, where, agreeably to the symbolical language ^{7th ed.} of prophecy, κέρατα and θηρίον are to be understood as denoting persons.

3. In the same way, these Pronouns when referring to a Singular noun are put in the Plural, if that noun has a collective signification, or is an abstract used for the concrete; as, Matt. i. 21 τὸν λαὸν . . . αὐτῶν, xiv. 14; Phil. ii. 15 γενεά, ἐν οἷς, 3 Jno. 9 ἡ ἐκκλησία . . . αὐτῶν, Eph. v. 12 σκότος (ἐσκοτισμένοι) ὑπ' αὐτῶν, Mark vi. 46 . . . τὸν ὄχλον, καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, Jno. xv. 6, see Lücke in loc.; Luke vi. 17, cf. § 22, 3 (but Acts xxii. 5 does not belong here); cf. Soph. Trach. 545; Thuc. 6, 91; 1, 136; Plat. Tim. 24 b. and Phaedr. 260 a.; Xen. Cyr. 6, 3, 4; Diod. S. 18, 6. This is very frequent in the Sept., Isa. lxv. 1; Exod. xxxii. 11, 33; Deut. xxi. 8; 1 Sam. xiv. 34; cf. Judith ii. 3; iv. 8; Eccclus. xvi. 8; Wisd. v. 3, 7.¹ In Phil. iii. 20 ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἐξ οὗ, it was supposed

¹ In this way some expositors (e.g. Reiche) explain also Rom. vi. 21 τίνα καρπὸν εἶχετε τότε ἐφ' οἷς (that is, καρποῖς) νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε. See, however, § 23, 2, p. 158.

that the opposite construction occurs, that is, a Sing. pronoun referring to a Plural noun (Bhdy. 295); but *ἐξ οὗ* has become in usage nothing more than an adverb, exactly equivalent in sense to *unde*. On the other hand, in 2 Jno. 7 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος, etc., appears a transition from the Plural *μὴ ὁμολογούντες*, etc. to the collective Singular.

Different from this is Acts xv. 36 κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐν αἷς, where *πᾶσα πόλις* of itself (exclusively of the inhabitants), implies a plurality (*πᾶσαι πόλεις*) cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 92, and 2 Pet. iii. 1 ταύτην ἤδη δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς, etc., where *δύο* is implied in *δευτέραν*. I do not know of an exact parallel, but the opposite construction πάντες ὅστις, which occurs not unfrequently, may be compared with it (Rost 468).

129 Note 1. According to some expositors (e.g. Kühnöl) the pronoun now
 155 *ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ*, namely τῷ δαμονίῳ, Acts xii. 21 ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτούς, cf.
 vs. 22 ὁ δῆμος (Fr. Conject. I. p. 18 sq.), see Gesen. Lg. S. 740; Bornem.
 Xen. conviv. p. 210. But neither of these two passages proves anything
 in respect to N. T. usage. In the former, αὐτῷ refers to the demoniac
 himself, since in the Gospels, as is well known, the person possessed and
 the demon possessing him are often put for each other — (against which it
 is of no weight that Mark ix. 25 has ἐπετίμησε τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ);
 in the latter passage, αὐτούς refers to the Tyrians and Sidonians (deputies),
 mentioned in verse 20, as even Kühnöl has acknowledged; cf. Georgi,
 Vind. p. 208 sq. The verb *δημηγορεῖν* does not interfere with this, as the
 king's statement was made in a full assembly of the people.

Note 2. The Neut. of the interrogative pronoun τίς, and of the demon-
 strative οὗτος (αὐτός), are often employed adverbially, to denote *wherefore*
 135 *(why) therefore*. The former is so used also in Latin and German: *quid*
 174 *cunctaris? was zögerst du?* and originally these pronouns were considered
 as real Accusatives (Hm. Vig. 882; Bhdy. 130). With regard to the
 strengthened demonstrative αὐτὸ τοῦτο compare 2 Pet. i. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο
 σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρενεγκαντες (Xen. Anab. 1, 9, 21; Plat. Protag. 310 e.
 αὐτὰ ταῦτα νῦν ἤκω παρά σε), Mith. 1041; Ast. Plat. legg. pp. 163, 169,
 214. Gal. ii. 10 does not belong here, see § 22, 4. As to τί see passages
 according to their various relations in Wahl, clav. 483. The Greeks use
 also ὃ and ᾧ for δι' ὃ and δι' ᾧ (Mith. 1062); but Mey. is wrong in trans-
 ferring to Acts xxvi. 16 the more poetic use of ᾧ (see § 39, note 1);
 whereas he himself on Gal. ii. 10 rejects on this very ground the proposal
 of Schott to take ὃ for δι' ὃ! Likewise the distributive τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο
 δέ partly . . . partly Heb. x. 33 is used adverbially (Her. 1, 30; 3, 132;
 Lucian. Nigr. 16); cf. Wetsten. II. 423; Mith. 740. (On 1 Cor. vi. 11
 ταῦτά τινες ἦτε, where two constructions are blended, see § 23, 5.)

[Note 3. Τί is used not as an interrogative, but as an exclamatory des-

ignation of degree, in Matt. vii. 14 *τί στενή how strait is the gate!* Luke xii. 49 *τί θέλω how would I* (how much I wish!). This use is unknown to the classics, but is found in the Sept., e.g. 2 Sam. vi. 20, where the Hebrew *תַּךְ* is rendered in this way.]

§ 22. PERSONAL AND POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS.

1. The personal pronouns, in accordance with Hebrew circumstantiality, are far more frequently employed in the Greek of the N. T. than in the classics.¹ Particularly,

Αὐτοῦ, σου, etc., with substantives (especially in connection with the Middle Voice § 38, 2), as Jno. ii. 12; Luke vi. 20; vii. 50; xi. 34; xxiv. 50; Matt. vi. 17; xv. 2; Mark xii. 30; 1 Pet. iii. 11; Rom. ix. 17; xvi. 7; Acts xxv. 21, etc. (cf. 1 Macc. i. 6; Josh. xxiii. 2; xxiv. 1; Neh. ix. 34);

The subject Acc. with the Inf., as Luke x. 35 *ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπ' ἀνέρ- 130*
χεσθαι με ἀποδώσω, Jno. ii. 24; Heb. vii. 24; Acts i. 3; 6th ed.

Oblique cases with a participle and at the same time with the principal verb, as Mark x. 16 *ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά*, ix. 28; Acts vii. 21; Luke xvi. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 16; (cf. below, no. 4.) So especially in the Apocalypse. On the other hand, in Matt. xxii. 37 and Rev. ix. 21 the repetition of the pronoun is probably to be charged to the account of the rhythm.

In connection with this tendency to multiply pronouns, only a few passages occur where the pronoun is wanting when it might have been expected, e.g. Acts xiii. 3 *καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς 136*
ἀπέλυσαν (αὐτούς), Mark vi. 5; Eph. v. 11; Phil. i. 6; 2 Thess. 7th ed.
iii. 12; Heb. iv. 15; xiii. 17; 1 Tim. vi. 2; Jno. x. 29; Luke xiv. 4 (cf. Demosth. Conon. 728 b. *ἐμοὶ περιπεσόντες . . . ἐξέδυσαν*).² On the other hand, in Matt. xxi. 7 the better reading is *ἐπεκάθισεν*, and in 1 Cor. x. 9 *πειράζειν* may be taken absolutely; in 2 Tim. ii. 11 *σὺν αὐτῷ* would be heavy in an aphoristic saying. In 1 Pet. ii. 11 *ὑμᾶς*, which appears in the MSS. now after *παρακαλῶ* now after *ἀπέχεσθαι*, is certainly not genuine. In acclamations, such as Matt. xxvii. 22 *σταυρωθήτω*, the omission of the pronoun is very natural (in German the Inf. would likewise be used without a

¹ In the language of Homer, however, the possessive pronoun *ἐς* is quite parallel. Later (and sometimes earlier) prose authors use also *αὐτός* thus abundanter. Schaefer. ind. Aesop. p. 124; Schoem. ad Isaeum, p. 382.

² In Latin compare Sallust, Jug. 54, 1 universos in concione laudat atque agit gratias (iis), Cic. Orat. 1, 15 si modo erunt ad eum delata et tradita (ei), Liv. 1, 11 and 20. Cf. Krits on the first passage.

pronoun : *kreuzigen* !) ; yet the parallel passage Mark xv. 13 has *σταύρωσον αὐτόν*. (In Greek authors the omission of the Pronoun is carried much further ; see Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 294 ; Bremi, Lys. p. 50 ; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 78, 157, 232 ; V. 556, 567.)

In Eph. iii. 18 *τί τὸ πλάτος*, etc., the addition of *αὐτῆς* (*ἀγάπης*) would hardly help the passage ; see Mey. Many (e.g. Kühnöl) quite erroneously hold the pronoun to be redundant in Matt. xxi. 41 *κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτοὺς*. Without *αὐτοὺς* the statement would be altogether general. *Αὐτοὺς* is required to connect it with the case in hand, — with the *γεωργοὺς* spoken of.

2. Instead of the personal pronouns the nouns themselves are sometimes employed : — either from the writer's inadvertence, or
157 with a view to relieve the reader's uncertainty when more than one reference of the pronoun is possible, or because the noun stands at a great distance ; as, Jno. iii. 23 f. ; x. 41 ; Luke iii. 19 ; Eph. iv. 12 ; cf. 1 Kings ix. 1 ; xii. 1 (Xen. Eph. 2, 13 ; Thuc. 6, 105 ; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 29) ; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 55.

But in Jno. iv. 1 *Ἰησοῦς* is repeated because the apostle wishes to quote the express words which the Pharisees had heard ; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 23. Further, those passages in Christ's discourses must not be referred to this head, in which, instead of the pronoun, the name of a person or of an office is repeated for the sake of emphasis ; as, Mark ix. 41 *ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε*, Luke xii. 8 *πᾶς δὲ ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ . . . καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ*, Jno. vi. 40 ; 1 Cor. i. 8, 21 ; 1 Jno. v. 6 ; Col. ii. 11, and often. Cf. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 5 e. ; Aeschyl. Prom. vinct. 312 ; Cic. fam. 2, 4. In all these instances the pronoun would be out of place,

131 and would mar the rhetorical effect. Least of all does the familiar
6th ed. appellation *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, under which Jesus speaks of himself in the Synoptic Gospels as of a third person, stand for *ἐγώ*.

At other times the repetition of the noun is intended to denote an emphatic antithesis ; as, Jno. ix. 5 *ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ᾧ, φῶς εἴμι*
137 *τοῦ κόσμου*, xii. 47 *οὐκ ἦλθον ἵνα κρῖνω τὸν κόσμον ἀλλ' ἵνα*
7th ed. *σώσω τὸν κόσμον* (Xen. An. 3, 2, 23 *οἱ βασιλέως ἄκοντος ἐν τῇ βασιλείῳ χώρᾳ . . . οἰκοῦσι*), Arrian. Al. 2, 18, 2 ; Krü. 114 (Liv. 1, 10, 1 ; 6, 2, 9 ; 38, 56, 3). Accordingly, even in the following passages no one will regard the repetition of the noun as idle : Rom. v. 12 *δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσηλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος*, Jno. x. 29 *ὁ πατήρ μου, ὃς δέδωκέ μοι, μείζων πάντων ἐστί· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἀρπάξαι ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου*. Cf. besides, Acts iii. 16. See § 65.

In Acts x. 7 the better Codd. have the personal pronoun (see Kühnöl in loc.) and τῷ Κορηλίῳ is evidently a gloss. The passages which Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 190 quotes from Greek authors are not all to the point, nor is the reading in all of them fully established.

The assertion that it is especially characteristic of Mark to repeat the noun instead of the pronoun αὐτός or ἐκεῖνος (Schulze in Keil's Analect. II. II. 112) is not entirely correct. In Mark ii. 18 the nouns were indispensable, — (the writer could not put into the mouth of the inquirers an ἐκεῖνοι referring to *his*, the historian's, words); in vi. 41, and also in xiv. 67, the pronouns would have been quite unsuitable; in ii. 27 the nouns were employed for the sake of antithesis; in i. 34; iii. 24; v. 9; x. 46 we find circumstantiality (as often in Cæsar), and not strictly the use of nouns for pronouns. Compare Ellendt, as above.

3. The pronoun αὐτός¹ is frequently so employed, through the negligence of the writer, that in the propositions immediately preceding there is no substantive expressed to which it can be directly 158 referred.

Such cases may be reduced to *four* classes:

1) Αὐτός in the Plur. very frequently refers to a collective noun, particularly the name of a place or country (cf. § 21, 3), which includes the idea of the inhabitants; as, Matt. iv. 23 ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, that is Γαλιλαίων (from ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν), ix. 35 (Luke iv. 15); Matt. xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 9 cf. vs. 8; Acts viii. 5; xx. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13 ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα . . . ὑποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, v. 19 θεὸς ᾧ ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσω ἐαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα, Jno. xvii. 2. This usage is common enough in Greek authors, cf. Thuc. 1, 27, 136; Lucian. Tim. 9; dial. mort. 12, 4; Dion. H. IV. 2117; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 59.²

Akin to this is, 2) the use of αὐτός in reference to an abstract 132 noun to be deduced from a preceding concrete, or *vice versa*; as, Jno. viii. 44 ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ (ψεύδους), see Lücke 138 in loc.,³ Rom. ii. 26 ἐὰν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου 7th ed. φυλάσσει, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ (of such an ἀκρόβυστος) εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται; cf. Theodoret. I. 914 τοῦτο τῆς ἀποστο-

¹ Compare, in general, *Hm. diss. de pronom. αὐτός* in the Acta Seminar. philol. Lips. Vol. I. 42 sqq. and his Opusc. I. 308 sqq.

² Simpler is the reference of αὐτός in the Plur. to an abstract signifying in itself nothing more than a community of individuals, as ἐκκλησία. On this see § 21, 3. On Col. iv. 15 according to the reading αὐτῶν, see *Mey.* in loc.

³ The other explanation: *father of the liar*, appears neither grammatically simpler nor preferable in meaning. Indeed, *father of falsehood* is a more comprehensive idea, and John has a predilection for abstract expressions.

λικῆς χάριτος ἰδίου· αὐτοῖς γὰρ (ἀποστόλοις) etc.¹ In Luke xxiii. 51 αὐτῶν refers to the Sanhedrim, implied in the predicate βουλευτῆς verse 50. Cf. Jonah i. 3 εἶρε πλοῖον βαδίζον εἰς Θαρσὶς . . . καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦ πλεῦσαι μετ' αὐτῶν, etc., see above, No. 2. Sallust. Cat. 17, 7 simul confisum, si coniuratio valuisset, facile apud illos (that is, coniuratos) principem se fore. Similar to this passage from Luke would be Matt. viii. 4 (Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14) εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, if the pronoun referred to the foregoing ἱερεῖ, and thus αὐτοῖς agreed with the Plur. ἱερεῖσι understood; but, if the cured man has already received from the priests permission to present the purification-offering prescribed by the law, the priests would need no further μαρτύριον of his being cleansed. See 4) below.

- 159 3) Αὐτός sometimes refers to something implied in a preceding word, or even in the verb of the sentence; as, 1 Pet. iii. 14 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, that is τῶν κακούντων ὑμᾶς, or those from whom you must suffer (πάσχειν), see Hm. Vig. 714;² Eph. v. 12 τὰ κρυφῇ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν, that is τῶν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους ποιούντων verse 11; Acts x. 10. Cf. Aristoph. Plut. 566; Thuc. 1, 22, 1 and Poppo, in loc.; Heinichen, ind. ad Euseb. III. 539. On Acts xii. 21 see § 21, note 1, p. 142.

4) Αὐτός sometimes has no antecedent grammatically implied in what precedes, but must be referred to some subject assumed to be known; as, Luke i. 17 αὐτὸς προελεύσεται αὐτοῦ (i.e. before the Messiah), see Kühnöl in loc.—(αὐτός of an individual recognized in a certain circle as head or leader, as in αὐτὸς ἔφα; so of Christ in 1 Jno. ii. 12; 2 Jno. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 4). In Luke v. 17 εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς, the pronoun expresses the general notion *the sick, those who required healing* (among the persons present in the synagogue); the pronoun cannot be referred to verse 15 (though this is done even by Bengel). On the other hand, αὐτῶν in Acts iv. 5 refers to the *Jews*, among whom the events occurred (in verse 1, moreover, their priests et al. are mentioned; and several times λαός in the same verse and sequel has pointed to 139 the Jews). In Matt. xii. 9 the pronoun refers to those (Galileans) 140 among whom Jesus was at the time; in Heb. iv. 8; viii. 8;

¹ With the relative compare Testam. patr. p. 608 ἀπεκάλυψε τῇ Χανανίτιδι Βησουέ, οἷς (Χαναναίοις) εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς μὴ ἀποκαλύψαι. Compare also the passage of an ancient poet in Cic. orat. 2, 46, 193: neque paternum adspectum es veritus, quem (patrem) aetate exacta indigem Liberum lacerasti, and Gell. 2, 30, 6.

² Otherwise in Epiphani. II. 368 a. εὐχαί μοι, πάτερ, ὅπως ὀφθαλμοῖς . . . πιστεύω, τέκνον, τῇ ἐσταυρωμένῳ, καὶ ἔξαι ταύτην (ὀφθαλμοῖς).

xi. 28 it refers to the Israelites, suggested to the reader by the ¹³³ antecedent particulars. The above-mentioned *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς* ^{6th ed.} Matt. viii. 4 comes under this head; those meant by *αὐτοῖς* are the Jews (the public, the community among whom the precepts of Moses, *ὁ προσέταξε Μωϋσῆς*, are recognized). In Jno. xx. 15 *αὐτόν* presupposes that the inquirer knew who was meant, inasmuch as it was thought he had taken him away; or Mary in answering, engrossed with the thought of the Lord, attributes to the inquirer her own impressions. Cf. besides, Poppo, Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 31; 5, 4, 42; Thuc. III. I. 184; Lehmann, Lucian. II. 325; IV. 429; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 286, and, generally, van Hengel, annotat. p. 195 sqq.

In Luke xviii. 34 *αὐτοί* refers to *τοὺς δώδεκα* and *αὐτοὺς* in verse 31 (what intervenes being a statement of our Lord's). So also in Heb. iv. 13 ¹⁶⁰ *αὐτοῦ* relates to *τοῦ θεοῦ* in 12; and *αὐτῆς* in Luke xxi. 21 to *Ἱερουσαλήμ* in 20. Lastly, in 2 Cor. vi. 17 *ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν*, in a somewhat transformed quotation from the Old Test., refers to *ἄπιστοι* in verse 14; and in Rom. x. 18 *αὐτῶν* suggests to every reader the preachers, who were also mentioned concretely in 15. On Acts xxvii. 14, where some have referred *αὐτῆς* to the *ship*, see Kühnöl in loc. In Luke ii. 22 *αὐτῶν* points to mother and child (Mary and Jesus). Expositors are not agreed whether in Heb. xii. 17 *αὐτῇ* refers to *μετάνοιαν* or to *εὐλογίαν*; from the correlation between *εὐρίσκειν* and *ἐκζητεῖν*, however, the former reference is the more probable. In Matt. iii. 16 *αὐτῷ* and *ἐπ' αὐτόν* relate unquestionably to Jesus.

A slight inadvertence of another sort appears in Matt. xii. 15; xix. 2 *ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας*. Here the pronoun grammatically refers to *ὄχλοι*, but logically this reference can be only a loose one: *he healed them*, that is the sick in the crowds, *collectively* (xiv. 14 *ἐθεράπευσε τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν*). Compare also Luke v. 17.

According to some expositors the *demonstrative* also is, in a similar way, construed *ad sensum* in 2 Cor. v. 2. After *ἐν τούτῳ* they supply *σώματι*, as being implied in *ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους*. But it is much simpler to supply *σκήνει*, from verse 4. That the Greeks, however, did employ the demonstrative as well as *αὐτός* with a want of precision in the reference is well known, cf. Mätzner, Antiph. p. 200. In fact, Acts x. 10 would be an instance of this, if the reading *ἐκείνων* for *αὐτῶν* were correct.

4. A repetition of this pronoun (*αὐτός*), and also of the other personal pronouns, occurs,

a. When subjoined for the sake of perspicuity, in sentences where the principal noun is followed by a number of other words; as, Mark v. 2 *ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθέως ἀπήντησεν αὐτῷ*, ix. 28; Matt. iv. 16; v. 40; viii. 1; xxvi. 71; Acts vii. 21; Jas.

iv. 17; Rev. vi. 4; Col. ii. 13 *καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς παρὰ πτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς*, etc. Phil. i. 7. In the majority of these passages a participial construction, equivalent to an independent clause, precedes; in this same case even the Greek authors often add the pronoun, Paus. 8, 38, 5; Herod. 3, 10, 6. Further, cf. Plat. Apol. 40 d.; symp. c. 21; Xen. C. 1, 3, 15, and Oec. 10, 4; Paus. 2, 3, 8; Arrian. Epict. 3, 1; also Cic. Catil. 2, 12, 27; Liv. 1, 2; Sall. Catil. 40, 1; Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 54; Schwarz, Comment. p. 217. The pronoun is used for the sake of emphasis in Jno. xviii. 11 *τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ, οὐ μὴ πίνω αὐτό*; Matt. vi. 4; 1 Pet. v. 10 (Acts ii. 23); Rev. xxi. 6. (After a case absolute, the pronoun, in the case required by the verb, is introduced almost indispensably; as, Rev. iii. 12 *ὁ νικῶν, ποιήσω αὐτόν*, Jno. xv. 2; Matt. xii. 36; Acts vii. 40, cf. Plat. Theaet. 173 d.; Ael. anim. 5, 34; 1, 48 a.)

b. This redundancy occurs more frequently in relative clauses, as Mark vii. 25 *γυνή, ἥς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον*, i. 7; Rev. vii. 2 *οἱς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν*, etc., iii. 8; vii. 9; xiii. 8; xx. 8; similar to which is Mark xiii. 19 *Θλίψις, οἷα οὐ γέγονε τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως*. So also with a relative adverb, as Rev. xii. 6, 14 *ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον* etc.

In the Sept. (in accordance with the Hebrew idiom, see Gesen. Lg. 743), such usage is far more frequent, as Exod. iv. 17; Lev. xi. 32, 34; xiii. 52; xv. 4, 9, 17, 20, 24, 26; xvi. 9, 32; xviii. 5; Num. xvii. 5; Deut. xi. 25; Josh. iii. 4; xxii. 19; Judg. xviii. 5, 6; Ruth i. 7; iii. 2, 4; 1 Kings xi. 34; xiii. 10, 25, 31; 2 Kings xix. 4; Baruch ii. 4; iii. 8; Neh. viii. 12; ix. 19; Isa. i. 21; Joel iii. 7; Ps. xxxix. 5; Judith v. 19; vii. 10; x. 2; xvi. 3; 3 Esr. iii. 5; iv. 54; vi. 32, etc.; see Thiersch, de Pentat. alex. p. 126 sq.

Even in Greek prose, however, *αὐτός* (Göttling, Callim. p. 19 sq.; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 550), or a demonstrative, is sometimes superadded in a relative clause: Xen. C. 1, 4, 19; D. S. 1, 97; 17, 35; Paus. 2, 4, 7; Soph. Philoct. 316 (cf. in Latin Cic. fam. 4, 3; Acad. 2, 25; Philipp. 2, 8). Yet the demonstrative could very seldom be found so closely connected with the relative as in most of the preceding passages (which are almost all furnished by a style that has a Hebraistic tinge).¹ See, further, Hm. Soph. Philoct. p. 58; Vc. Fritzsche, Quaest. Lucian. p. 109 sq.

In Acts iii. 13 the writer drops the relative structure in the second clause

¹ In Aristoph. Av. 1238 the Cod. Rav. has *οἱς θυτέον αὐτοῖς* for the rec. *οἱς θυτ. αὐτοῖς*. On another accumulation of the pronoun see below, § 23, 3.

(see just below). In Rom. vii. 21 the first *ἐγώ* does not appear to me to belong to the same proposition as the second, see § 61, 5. Different also are those passages in which with the pers. pron. still another word is joined by which the relative is exegetically defined, as Gal. iii. 1 οἱς κατ' ὀφθαλμούς Ἰησοῦς Χρ. προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῶν (*in animis vestris*) ἐσταυρωμένος (Lev. xv. 16; xxi. 20; xxii. 4; Ruth ii. 2); Rev. xvii. 9 ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν, xiii. 12; cf. Gen. xxiv. 3, 37; Judg. vi. 10; Exod. xxxvi. 1; Lev. xvi. 32; 141 Judith ix. 2. Likewise in Gal. ii. 10 ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ^{7th ed.} the emphasis in the subjoined αὐτό, strengthened by τοῦτο, is evident (Bornem. Luc. p. LIV). We must not bring under this head 1 Pet. ii. 24 ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν etc., where αὐτός obviously stands by itself, and gives additional force to the antithesis with ἁμαρτ. ἡμῶν. In Matt. iii. 12 οὐ τὸ πύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, the relative serves 162 instead of τούτου to connect what follows with the preceding clause, and both pronouns are to be taken separately, as if it read, *he has HIS winnowing shovel in HIS hand*. Eph. ii. 10 οἱς προηρόμασεν is to be considered 135 as an attraction for ἃ προηρ. Lastly, in Eph. ii. 21 ἐν κυρίῳ belongs ^{6th ed.} probably with εἰς τὰν ἄγιον.

Sometimes αὐτός is repeated in quick succession, though referring to different subjects: Mark viii. 22 φέρουσιν αὐτῷ (Χριστῷ) τυφλὸν καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτόν (Χριστόν), ἵνα αὐτοῦ (τυφλοῦ) ἄψῃται, Mark ix. 27, 28. So οὗτος in Jno. xi. 37. See below, § 67.

In a clause following a relative clause, and where ὃς or its continued influence might be expected, Greek authors frequently—indeed, almost uniformly (Bhdy. 304)—employ καὶ αὐτός (οὗτος), the writer modifying the construction, (Hm. Vig. 707; Ast. Plat. legg. p. 449; Boisson. Nic. p. 32; Bornem. Xenoph. conv. p. 196; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 68; rep. I. 197; Foertsch, observ. in Lysiam, p. 67; Weber, Dem. 355; Teipel, Scriptores Graec., Germ., Lat. a relativa verbor. construct. saepe neque injuria semper discessisse. Coesfeld, 1841, 4to.; cf. Grotefend, lat. Gramm. § 143, 5; Kritz, Sallust. II. 540). From the N. T. may be quoted under this head, 2 Pet. ii. 3 οἱς τὸ κρίμα ἔκταλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, Acts iii. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 6, with less appropriateness Rev. xvii. 2 μεθ' ἧς ἐπόρευσαν ... καὶ ἐμεθύσθησαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, where it was necessary to avoid the construction with the relative on account of the nouns to be connected with the pronoun. In Hebrew, as is well known, owing to its great simplicity, the continuing of a sentence without the relative is very common; yet an idiom foreign to the genius of the language should not be introduced into the text by supplying וְאֵל with the following clause. (In passages such as Jno. i. 6; Acts x. 36; Luke ii. 36; xix. 2, to require the relative instead of αὐτός or οὗτος, is to misapprehend the simplicity of N. T. diction; particularly as even Greek authors not unfrequently employ the same idiom; see Aelian 12, 18; Strabo 8, 371; Philostr. Soph. 1, 25; cf. Kypke I. 347. On the other

hand, in 1 Cor. vii. 13 for ἡγίς ἔχει ἄνδρα ἀπίστον καὶ αὐτὸς συνευδοκεῖ etc. the expression ὅς συνευδ. etc. might have been used.)

In the N. T. ὁ αὐτός, *the same*, takes after it a Dat. of the person when it denotes *the same (identical) with*, as 1 Cor. xi. 5; cf. Her. 4, 119; Xen. M. 1, 1, 13; 2, 1, 5; Cyr. 3, 3, 35; 7, 1, 2; Isocr. Paneg. c. 23; Plat. Menex. 244 b.; Dio. Ch. 332, 97.

Note. Αὐτός in the Nom., as is well known, never stands in classic Greek for the unemphatic *he* (Krü. 109, 114). From the N. T. also¹ no decisive passages can be produced to prove this usage [which Bttm. Gramm. des 7th ed. neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 93 f. wrongly concedes] (cf. Fr. Mt. p. 47); even in Luke, who employs αὐτός the most frequently (cf., in particular, Luke 163 v. 16, 17; xix. 2), it never occurs without a certain emphasis. It denotes, a. *Self*, in complex antitheses, and for all the three persons, as Mark 136 ii. 25 ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, Acts xviii. 19 ἐκείνους κατέλιπεν, αὐτὸς 6th ed. δὲ εἰσελθὼν, etc., Luke v. 37; x. 1; xviii. 39; 1 Cor. iii. 15; Mark i. 8; Jno. iv. 2; vi. 6; ix. 21; Luke vi. 42 πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν ... αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκίον οὐ βλέπων, Heb. xi. 11 πίστει καὶ αὐτῇ Σάρρα δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος ἔλαβεν even Sara herself (who had been incredulous), Jno. xvi. 27 αὐτὸς ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς *he himself*, of himself (without entreaty on my part, verse 26), Rom. viii. 23. Αὐτός was thus used by the disciples in speaking of Christ (compare the well known αὐτὸς ἔφα): Mark iv. 38; Luke v. 16; ix. 51; xxiv. (15) 36. Cf. Fischer, ind. Theophan. under αὐτός. See, in general, the Lexicons.

b. Emphatic *he, even he*: Matt. i. 21 καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαόν, xii. 50; Col. i. 17. Αὐτός is not used for the unemphatic *he* also in Luke i. 22 (*he* himself, as distinguished from the rest: ἐπύγνωσαν), ii. 28 (*he* Simeon, as distinguished from the parents of Jesus, verse 27), iv. 15; vii. 5 (*he*, of himself, from his own resources), Acts xiv. 12 (*he* Paul, as leader, verse 11), Mark vii. 36; [1 Thess. iii. 11; iv. 16; v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 16; iii. 16.] (On the antithesis in Rom. viii. 23 αὐτοὶ ... ἐν ἑαυτοῖς see Fr. in loc.)

5. The reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ, etc., which originally (as compounded of ἐ and αὐτός) belongs to the third person, and in the N. T. is regularly so employed (frequently in antithesis and with emphasis, 1 Cor. x. 29; xiv. 4; Eph. v. 28, etc.), is also, when no ambiguity is to be apprehended, employed in reference to the first and second persons. It is used

a. In the Plural, — as well for the first person, Rom. viii. 23 (ἡμεῖς) αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν, 1 Cor. xi. 31; 2 Cor. i. 9; x. 12; Acts xxiii. 14, etc., as for the second, Jno. xii. 8 τοὺς πτωχοὺς πάντοτε

¹ According to Thiersch, de Pent. vers. Alex. p. 98, the LXX often use the masc. αὐτός for *he*; but not αὐτῇ or αὐτό, instead of which the demonstrative is regularly employed. In reference to the Apocrypha, Wahl, clavis p. 80, utterly denies such a use.

ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, Phil. ii. 12 τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε, Matt. iii. 9; xxiii. 31; Acts xiii. 46; Heb. iii. 13; x. 25, etc.

b. In the Singular, though far less frequently (Bhdy. 272), in reference to the second person, as Jno. xviii. 34 ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις, where σεαυτοῦ in Codd. B [Sin.] and others is undoubtedly a correction; in Rom. xiii. 9; Matt. xxii. 39 Sept. and Gal. v. 14 σεαυτὸν is preponderant.

This same usage is found in Greek authors (under b. in particular cf. Xen. M. 1, 4, 9; C. 1, 6, 44; Aristot. Nicom. 2, 9; 9, 9; Aelian. 1, 21; Arrian. Epict. 4, 3, 11), see Locella, Xenoph. Eph. 164; Bremi, Aeschin. oratt. I. 66; Hm. Soph. Trach. 451; Boisson. Philostr. Her. p. 326; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 932; Held, Plut. Aem. Paul. p. 130. Yet compare the assertion of an ancient grammarian, Apollonius, in Wolf and Bttm. Mus. antiq. stud. I. 360 and Eustath. 143 ad Odys. ε. p. 240. (On ἑαυτῶν etc. for ἀλλήλων see the Lexicons; 7th ed. 164 cf. Döderlein, Synon. III. 270.)

In the classic (Attic) writers αὐτοῦ etc. is of frequent occurrence as a reflexive (Arndt, de pronom. reflex. ap. Graec. Neobrandenb. 1836, 4to.); in many passages, however, the Codd. vary between αὐτοῦ and αὐτοῦ.¹ It is the more difficult to determine on *internal* grounds which of these in each particular case is the true reading, because in Greek a reflexive may occur at a considerable distance from the principal subject,² and because 137 it often depended entirely on the writer whether he would use a reflexive 6th ed. or not; see Bttm. 10 exc. ad Demosth. Mid. p. 140 sqq.;³ F. Hermann, comm. crit. ad Plutarch. superst. p. 37 sq.; Benseler, Isocr. Areop. p. 220. Likewise in the N. T., in which since Griesbach αὐτοῦ has often been adopted, cautious editors have frequently been at a loss in deciding whether αὐτοῦ or αὐτοῦ should be preferred. Sometimes either would be appropriate. In Matt. iii. 16, for instance, εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν might be used from the narrator's point of view; on the other hand, ἐφ' αὐτόν would refer directly to the subject of the verb εἶδε, that is, Jesus (Krü. 110). In the N. T. it is, in general, unlikely that a reflexive should be used in reference to a remote subject, that is, one which is not in the

¹ In the later writers, as Aesop, the Scholiasts, etc. αὐτοῦ seems to predominate; see Schaeff. ind. ad Aesop. p. 124. Cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 163.

² Cf., however, Held, Plut. Timol. p. 373.

³ Bremi, in the Jahrb. der Philol. IX. S. 171, says: "On the use of αὐτοῦ and αὐτοῦ it is easy to lay down rules, but in certain cases the decision will always remain doubtful; and it is far more difficult in Greek than in Latin to hit the mark," etc. "When the reference to the subject predominates in the mind, the reflexive is used; but when the subject is viewed as a more remote object, the pronoun of the 3d person. In Greek one must yield rather to his individual impression, if you please, his mood at the moment." Further, see some good remarks on reciprocal pronouns in general by Hoffmann, in the Jahrb. d. Philol. VII. S. 38 ff.

same proposition as the pronoun; this is owing to the simplicity of its narrative style, which, in like manner, disdains to adhere closely to the relative construction, see above p. 149. Accordingly, in Matt. in the passage referred to and in Eph. i. 17 αὐτόν, αὐτοῦ, should be adopted without hesitation, but αὐτοῦ in Acts xii. 11; Heb. v. 7; Rom. xiv. 14; see Fr. Exc. 5 ad Matt. p. 858 sqq. (where the view of Matthiae ad Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 800 and Gramm. I. 355 is examined); Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 159 sq. On the other hand, it deserves attention, as remarked by Bengel, appar. ad Matt. i. 21, that in the Codd. of the N. T. the prepositions ἀπό, ἐπί, ὑπό, κατά, μετά, [ἀντί] are never written ἀφ', ἐφ', etc. before αὐτου. Hence, with Bleek (Epist. to the Heb. II. 69), it might be inferred that the N. T. writers never employed the reflexive form αὐτοῦ, (but used, wherever necessary, ἑαυτοῦ instead of it). In fact, recent editors have printed the form αὐτοῦ almost everywhere; as the uncial Codd. of the N. T. and of the Sept. that have diacritic marks recognize αὐτοῦ almost
 144 exclusively (Tdf. praef. N. T. p. 26 sq. [ed. vii. p. 58 sq.]). These Codd.,
 7th ed. to be sure, are not of greater antiquity than the eighth century, and the
 165 expression "*ferè constanter*" suggests the desirableness of a more accurate collation. Now it is true that in most passages a reflexive is not absolutely required; yet it is difficult to believe that Paul in Rom. iii. 25 could have written εἰς ἔδειξεν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ (in the face of ἐν αἵματι αὐτοῦ), or Jno. in ix. 21 αὐτὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ; compare also Eph. i. 9; Rom. xiv. 14; Luke xix. 15; xiii. 34; Mark viii. 35; Rev. xi. 7; xiii. 2. Hence in the N. T. also, the choice between αὐτοῦ and αὐτοῦ must be left to the *discreet* judgment of editors.

6. The personal pronouns ἐγώ, σύ, ἡμεῖς, etc. are indispensable in the oblique cases, but in the Nom. they are regularly employed
 138 only when emphasis — and mostly in consequence of an antithesis
 7th ed. — is expressed or implied in them; as, Phil. iv. 11 ἐγὼ ἔμαθον ἐν οἷς εἰμι αὐτάρκης εἶναι, Jno. ii. 10 πᾶς ἄνθρωπος . . . σὺ τετάρηκας etc., Rom. vii. 17; Luke xi. 19; Acts x. 15; Mark xiv. 29; Jno. xviii. 38 f.; Gal. ii. 9; Acts xi. 14 σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου, Jno. x. 30; Acts xv. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 12; Luke i. 18; Matt. vi. 12 ἀφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν etc., Jno. iv. 10 σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτόν (while I asked of thee, verses 7, 9), Mark vi. 37 δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν (ye, since they themselves have no provisions with them vs. 36), Jno. vi. 30; xxi. 22; Mark xiii. 9, 23; 1 Cor. ii. 3 f.; Matt. xvii. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 6.

So when the person is described by a word in apposition, as Jno. iv. 9 πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν etc., Rom. xiv. 4 σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρινῶν ἄλλότριον οἰκέτην, Jno. x. 33; Acts i. 24; iv. 24; Luke i. 76; Eph. iv. 1; or reference is made to some preceding description, as Jno. v. 44 (42, 43); Rom. ii. 3; or such description is assumed as

something known, as Jno. i. 30; Luke ix. 9 (*I*,—one who as king is certain of what has taken place); Eph. v. 32 (*I* as apostle); Jno. ix. 24; Gal. vi. 17; 1 Cor. xi. 23. *Σύ* is used in addresses particularly when one out of many is meant, as Jno. i. 43; Jas. ii. 3; or when the person addressed is made prominent by an attributive, as 2 Tim. ii. 1; Matt. xi. 23.

These pronouns nowhere occur wholly without emphasis and where they might have been dispensed with (Bornem. Xen. Conv. 187). For when in Eph. v. 32, for instance, we find *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστόν*, but in 1 Cor. i. 12; Rom. xv. 8 *λέγω δέ*,—in the first passage an emphasis is intended, in the other two, none. Moreover, the Codd. vary much with regard to the use or omission, as well as the position, of these pronouns; and each case must be decided, not according to any fancied peculiarity of style in the separate writers (Gersd. I. 472 f.), but according to the nature of the sentence.

The personal pronoun is both used and omitted in close succession in 166 Luke. x. 23, 24 *οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε . . . πολλοὶ προφήται . . . ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν, ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε*. Only the latter case, however, contains a real antithesis (*ὑμεῖς* opposed to *προφῆται, βασιλ.*, etc.); in the first, the *ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε* are properly none other than those of which the *βλέπετε* is predicated. Compare 2 Cor. xi. 29 *τίς ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι*; where it must be noticed that in 7th ed. the latter member *πυροῦμαι* (which the apostle applies to *himself*) is a stronger word than *σκανδαλίζεσθαι*. In 1 Cor. xiii. 12 *τότε ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην*, some authorities add *ἐγὼ* to the latter verb; but incongruously, since the antithesis is expressed by the *vox verbi*.

It may be remarked, in passing, that in some books of the Old Test. the emphatic *אני* with a verb has been translated by the Sept. *ἐγὼ εἰμι*, with which the first person of the verb is then connected; as, Judg. xi. 27 *ἔφατ' ὁ κύριος καὶ νῦν ἐγὼ εἰμι οὐχ ἡμαρτον*; cf. v. 3; vi. 18; 1 Kings ii. 2.

On *αὐτός ἐγὼ* (in Acts x. 26 *καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτός*) see Fr. Rom. II. 75.

7. The possessive pronouns are sometimes to be understood *objectively*; as, Luke xxiii. 19 *ἡ ἐμὴ ἀνάμνησις memoria mei* (1 Cor. xi. 24), Rom. xi. 31 *τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει*, xv. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 31; xvi. 17 139 (not in Jno. xv. 10). So also in Greek authors (especially the 6th ed. poets); as, Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 28 *εὐνοία καὶ φιλία τῇ ἐμῇ*, Thuc. 1, 77 *τὸ ἡμέτερον δέος*, 6, 89; Plato, Gorg. 486 a.; Antiphon. 6, 41, etc. On the Latin cf. Kritiz, Sallust. Cat. p. 243.

Instead of a possessive pronoun *ἴδιος* is occasionally employed in the N. T.—an impropriety similar to the use of *proprius* instead of *suus* or *ejus* in later Latin (and of *οἰκεῖος* by the Byzantine

writers, see e.g. Index to Agath., Petr. Patric., Priscus, Dexipp., Glycas, and Theophanes in the Bonn edit.), — as Matt. xxii. 5 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, without any emphasis (that is, without any antithesis to κοινός or ἀλλότριος), its parallel in the second member is ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ; xxv. 14 ἐκάλεσε τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους, Tit. ii. 9; Jno. i. 42. So οἱ ἴδιοι ἄνδρες, husbands, in Eph. v. 22; Tit. ii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5, where οἱ ἄνδρες with or without a personal pronoun was sufficient; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 2.¹ Yet on the whole this usage is but rare, and from Greek authors no appropriate
 167 instance can be produced; for all that has been quoted by Schwarz, Comment. p. 687, and Weiske, de pleon. p. 62, is unsatisfactory or at most but plausible; so also D. S. 5, 40. Occasionally, *vice versa*, σφέτερος is found for ἴδιος; see Wessel. Diod. S. II. 9. On the other hand, the Fathers undoubtedly sometimes employ ἴδιος for the personal pronoun, cf. Epiphan. Opp. II. 622 a.

In by far the greater number of passages in which ἴδιος is used, there is an antithesis either evident or concealed; as, Jno. x. 3; • v. 18; Matt. xxv. 15; Acts ii. 6; Rom. viii. 32; xi. 24; xiv. 4, 5; 1 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 12; xiii. 12, also Matt. ix. 1. The parallels in 1 Cor. vii. 2 ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχέτω, καὶ ἐκάστη τὸν
 146 ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἔχέτω mean: *let each man have his wife, and let each*
 7th ed. *woman have her own husband*. Isocr. Demon. p. 18 σκόπει πρῶτον, πῶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ διώκησεν· ὁ γὰρ κακῶς διανοηθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων etc. Böhme, Kühnöl, and others, improperly regard ἴδιος in Heb. vii. 27 also, as used for the simple possessive pronoun; to ἰδία ἁμαρτίαι there, αἱ τοῦ λαοῦ (as ἀλλοτρίαι) are expressly opposed; cf. also iv. 10. When ἴδιος, as in Tit. i. 12 ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης (Wisd. xix. 12), is added to a personal pronoun, the pronoun merely expresses the idea of possession (*their* poet), and ἴδιος makes the antithesis, *their own* (not a foreign) poet. Similarly in Aeschin. Ctesiph. 294 c.; Xen. Hell. 1, 4, 13; Plato, Menex. 247 b. See Lob. Phryn. p. 441; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 70.

Κατά with the Acc. of a personal pronoun is considered as a circumlocution for the possessive pronoun, as Eph. i. 15 ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις *your faith*, Acts xvii. 28 οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιηταί, xviii. 15 νόμος ὁ καθ' ὑμᾶς, xxvi. 3,
 140 etc. This is in the main correct; it results, however, quite naturally from
 6th ed. the signification of κατά: ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις is properly *fides quae ad vos*

¹ Mey. attributes to these passages an emphasis which is either quite out of place (Matt. xxv. 14), or which could have been fully expressed by the pronoun. Even this strengthening of the pronoun by ἴδιος where there is no trace of an antithesis is foreign to the classics.

pertinet, apud vos (in vobis) est; cf. Aelian. 2, 12 ἡ κατ' αὐτὸν ἀπερίη, Dion. H. I. 235 οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοι. Cf. § 30, 3, note 5, p. 193.

Note 1. The Genitive of the personal pronouns, especially μου and σοῦ (more rarely ὑμῶν, ἡμῶν, αὐτοῦ), is, even when no particular emphasis is intended, very often¹ put *before* the governing substantive (and its Article); as, Matt. ii. 2; vii. 24; viii. 8; xvi. 18; xvii. 15; xxiii. 8; Mark v. 30; ix. 24; Rom. xiv. 16; Phil. ii. 2; iv. 14; Col. ii. 5; iv. 18; 1 Cor. viii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 16; iii. 10, 13; 2 Thess. ii. 17; iii. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 15; 2 Tim. i. 4; Philem. 5; Luke vi. 47; xii. 18; xv. 30; xvi. 6; xix. 35, etc. Jno. ii. 23; iii. 19, 21, 33; iv. 47; ix. 11, 21, 26; xi. 32; xii. 40; xiii. 1, etc. 168
1 Jno. iii. 20; Rev. iii. 1, 2, 8, 15; x. 9; xiv. 18; xviii. 5, etc. This takes place even in connection with a preposition; as, Jno. xi. 32 ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς πόδας; yet in many such passages variants are noted. See, in general, Gersdorf as above, 456 ff.

The Gen. of the pronoun is *designedly* put before the substantive, a. for emphasis, Eph. ii. 10 αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν ποίημα, more emphatic than ἔσμεν γὰρ π. αὐτοῦ, Luke xii. 30; xxii. 53; b. for the sake of contrast, 1 Cor. ix. 11 μέγα, εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσομεν, Phil. iii. 20; c. when the Gen. belongs to *two* nouns,² Jno. xi. 48 ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος, Acts xxi. 11; Luke xii. 35; Rev. ii. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. i. 15; 1 Thess. i. 3; ii. 19 (D. S. 11, 16). (The form ἐμοῦ depending on a noun, and placed after it, occurs only in such combinations as Rom. i. 12 πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ, xvi. 13 μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ.) The insertion of a personal pronoun between an article and a noun, as in 2 Cor. xii. 19 ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς, xiii. 9; i. 6, occurs on the whole but rarely. Cf. in general, 147
Krüger, Xen. Anab. 5, 6, 16. 7th ed.

When the noun is preceded by an adjective, the Genitive of the personal pronoun if placed before the noun is inserted between it and the adjective; as, 2 Cor. v. 1 ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία, 2 Cor. iv. 16 ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος.

Note 2. The Dative of the personal pronouns in easy and familiar speech is sometimes in Greek and Hebrew (just as it is with us) apparently superfluous (dativus ethicus, Bttm. 120, 2, and Dem. Mid. p. 9; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 138). As instances of this usage from the N. T.—where certainly it might have been expected—are enumerated sometimes Matt. xxi. 5, a quotation from the Old Test., sometimes Matt. xxi. 2; Rev. ii. 5, 16; Heb. x. 34. But in the first of these last three passages, ἀγάγετέ μοι means *bring him to me*, and ἀγάγετε alone would have been defective. In Rev. ii. ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ signifies *I will come* (punishing, cf. 14 ἔχω κατὰ

¹ Ὁ πατήρ μου and ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός is the usual order even in the N. T. Likewise the Gen. of αὐτός is regularly (see, however, Rost p. 459) put after the substantive.

² When this arrangement is not adopted, the pronoun must, for perspicuity, be repeated, Acts iv. 28 ὅσα ἡ χεὶρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλή σου προώρισε, etc. Matt. xii. 47; from the Sept., Luke xviii. 20; Acts ii. 17.

σου δλίγα, and 16 μετανόησον) to thee, on thee (ἐπὶ σέ iii. 3) quickly.¹ In 141 the third passage ἔχων ἑαυτοῖς ὑπαρξέν means *repositam* or *destinatam sibi* ^{th ed.} *habere*, for themselves, as belonging to themselves. Even in Matt. xxi. 5 σοί is not without force.

Note 3. Likewise ἡ ψυχὴ μου, σου, etc., is commonly regarded as a circumlocution for the personal pronoun (Weiske, Pleon. p. 72 sq.), now in quotations from the Old Test., as Matt. xii. 18; Acts ii. 27; Heb. x. 38, now in the N. T. itself, and this use of the word is usually considered as a Hebraism (Gesen. Lg. S. 752 f.; Vorst, Hebr. p. 121 sq.; Rück. on Rom. 169 xiii. 1). In no passage of the N. T., however, does ψυχὴ stand completely devoid of meaning, any more than נַפְשׁ in Hebrew (see my edition of Simonis); it signifies *the soul* (the spiritual principle on which Christianity operates 1 Pet. i. 9) in such expressions as 2 Cor. xii. 15 ἐκδανηθήσομαι ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, 1 Pet. ii. 25 ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, Heb. xiii. 17, or the *heart* (the seat of the affections and desires), as in Rev. xviii. 14 ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς ψυχῆς σου, Matt. xxvi. 38 περιλυτός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, Acts ii. 43 ἐγένετο πάση ψυχῇ φόβος. Even in Rom. ii. 9 ψυχὴ is not a mere redundancy; it denotes that in man which *feels* the θάλας and στενοχωρ., even should these come upon the body. In Rom. xiii. 1 πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσία ἐπερεχοῦσα ὑποτασσέσθω, the words πᾶσα ψυχὴ standing thus alone (cf. 1 Pet. iii. 20) may mean *every soul*, i.e. every person; but even in an enumeration of the inhabitants in any place, so many "*souls*" (Lat. *capita*) is not precisely the same as so many "*men*" (persons). Cf. also Acts iii. 23 Sept. And so the use of the word ψυχὴ contributes everywhere to vivacity or circumstantiality of discourse, which is totally different from pleonasm. Besides, ψυχὴ is not unfrequently so used in Greek authors also (cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 1, 27; Aelian. 1. 32), particularly the poets (Soph. 148 Philoct. 714; Oed. Col. 499, 1207);² and this use must be deemed not ^{th ed.} a Hebraism, but a relic of antique vivacity of expression. See further Georgi, Vind. p. 274; Schwarz, ad Olear. p. 28; Comment. p. 1439.³

¹ See on the similar phrase ἦκω σοι *Hm.* Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 179 (e.g. Lucian. pisc. 16 ἦξω ὑμῖν ἐκδικάσασα τὴν δίκην). It is a sort of *dativus incommodi*, § 31, 4 b.; cf. 1 Kings xv. 20, LXX.

² In these passages it is easy to discern the notion of *anima*, and I do not know why *Ellendt*, Lexic. Soph. II. 979, takes ψυχὴ here for a mere circumlocution. Likewise the passages from Plato which *Ast*, Lexic. Plat. III. 575, quotes, are deprived of their peculiar shade of meaning by the canon: *orationem amplificat*.

³ Matt. vi. 25, where ψυχὴ is opposed to σῶμα, can present no difficulty to any one acquainted with the anthropological notions of the Jews. Likewise καρδιά is not a mere circumlocution in Acts xiv. 17 ἐμπληθῶν τροφῆς κ. εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, and Jas. v. 5 ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, for otherwise it would have been possible to say, *he smote his heart*, for him, etc. Yet καρδιά is probably used here not merely — as נֶפֶשׁ is sometimes — in a material sense, agreeably to the physiological views of antiquity. to strengthen the heart, i.e. primarily the stomach, and through that the heart (even in Greek the signification *stomach* in καρδιά has not altogether disappeared), but includes the idea of the pleasures of eating; see *Baumgarten* on the latter passage.

1. The pronoun *οὗτος* sometimes refers, not to the noun locally nearest, but to one more remote, which, as the principal subject, was *mentally* the nearest, the most present to the writer's thoughts (Schaef. Demosth. V. 322; Stallb. Plat. Phaedr. p. 28, 157; Foertsch, obs. in Lysiam p. 74); as, Acts iv. 11 *οὗτός* (*Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* verse 10, the nearest preceding noun being *ὁ θεός*) *ἐστὶν ὁ λίθος*, 1 Jno. v. 20 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός*, that is, *ὁ θεός*, not *Χριστός* (which immediately precedes) as the older theologians on doctrinal considerations maintained; for in the first place, *ἀληθινὸς θεός* is a constant and exclusive epithet of the Father; and secondly, a warning against idolatry follows, and *ἀληθινὸς θεός* is invariably contrasted with *εἰδωλα*. A passage admitting of question is Acts viii. 26 *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος*, where some supply the nearest subject *Γάζα*, and others *ὁδός*, see Kühnöl in loc. and my bibl. RWB. L S. 395; I prefer the latter decidedly. The construction is more obvious in Acts vii. 19; 2 Jno. 7. (For examples from Greek prose, see Ast, Plat. Polit. 417; legg. p. 77.) On the other hand, *ἐκεῖνος* in Acts iii. 13 must be referred to the nearest subject (Bremi, Lys. p. 154; Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 73; Foertsch, as above; Krü. 118). So also in Jno. vii. 45, where *ἐκεῖνοι* denotes the members of the Sanhedrim (*ἀρχιερ. καὶ Φαρισ.*) grouped together (by the use of a single Article) as *one* body. For *οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος* so connected that the former refers to the more remote subject and the latter to the nearer, see Plut. vit. Dem. 3. (For *ἐκεῖνος* where only *one* subject is spoken of and *οὗτος*, or simply *αὐτός*, was to be expected, see 2 Cor. viii. 9; Tit. iii. 7.)

In Phil. i. 18 *καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω*, the demonstrative points merely to the main thought *Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται*; and in 2 Pet. i. 4 *διὰ τούτων* refers to *ἐπαγγέλματα*.

The Relative also is sometimes thought to refer thus to a more remote subject (cf. Bhdy. 297; Göller, Thuc. II. 21; Siebelis, Pausan. III. 52; Schoem. Isae. p. 242sq.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. 369, and, in regard to Latin, Kritz, Sallust. II. 115) e.g. in 1 Cor. i. 8 (Pott, in loc.) where *ὃς* is referred to *θεός* as the principal subject vs. 4, though *Ἰησ. Χριστ.* immediately precedes. This, however, is not necessary, either on account of *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησ. Χρ.* at the end of the vs. (cf. Col. ii. 11; Eph. iv. 12), or of *πιστὸς ὁ θεός* immediately following; for what is here asserted of God, the calling *εἰς κοινωνίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, is at the same time a calling to *βεβαιῶσθαι* through Christ, which can take place only in the fellowship

of Christ. To evade antiquarian difficulties this rule has been applied also to Heb. ix. 4 (see Kühnöl in l.), and on doctrinal grounds to ἐφ' ᾧ in Rom. v. 12, but in both cases very erroneously. In Heb. v. 7, and 2 Thess. ii. 9 there is no difficulty. In 2 Pet. iii. 12 δι' ἣν can very well be referred 143 to the nearest noun *ἡμέρας*, and ᾧ in 1 Pet. iv. 11 to the principal subject 144 ed. *θεός*. On Heb. iii. 6 οὗ οἶκος modern expositors are correct.

2. A demonstrative pronoun preceding a relative clause, if it has no special emphasis, is usually included in the relative pronoun (Krü. 124 f.). This occurs not only

a. When, if expressed, it would regularly or by attraction stand 171 in the same case with the relative, as α) Acts i. 24 ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω for τοῦτον ὃν, Rom. viii. 29; Jno. xviii. 26 συγγενὴς ὢν οὗ ἀπέκοψεν Πέτρος τὸ ὥτιον, 1 Cor. vii. 39; 2 Cor. xi. 12; Phil. iv. 11; β) Acts viii. 24 ὅπως μηδὲν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὢν εἰρήκατε for τούτων ᾧ εἰρ. xxi. 19; xxii. 15; xxvi. 16, 22; Luke ix. 36; Rom. xv. 18; Eph. iii. 20; 2 Cor. xii. 17; cf. Isa. ii. 8; Wisd. xii. 14; Tob. i. 8; xii. 2, 6. Plato, Gorg. 457 e.; Phaed. 94 c.; Isocr. Phil. p. 226, and de pace 388; Plut. virt. mul. p. 202; Xen. A. 1, 9, 25; Dem. ep. 5 in. and Olyn. I. p. 2 a.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. 368. But also,

b. When the demonstrative would require a different case, as Jno. xiii. 29 ἀγόρασον ὢν χρεῖαν ἔχομεν (ταῦτα ὢν), Rom. vi. 16; Matt. xix. 11; Acts viii. 19; xiii. 37; 1 Cor. xv. 36; 2 Pet. i. 9, cf. Xen. C. 6, 2, 1 ἀπὴργγελος ὢν ἐδέου, Eurip. Med. 735 ἐμμένειν ᾧ σου κλύω i.e. τοῦτοις ᾧ, see Elmsley in loc.; Lysias p. 152 Steph. μὴ καταγνῶσκετε ἀδικίαν τοῦ . . . δαπανῶντος ἀλλ' ὅσοι . . . εἰθισμένοι εἰσὶν ἀναλίσκειν for τούτων ὅσοι, see Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 139; cf. Kritz, Sallust. II. 301. And in this instance even the preposition on which the case of the demonstrative depends is also omitted; as, Rom. x. 14 πῶς πιστεύουσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν i.e. εἰς τοῦτον οὗ, etc.¹

150 If, when the demonstrative before the relative is omitted, a 145 ed. preposition precedes, the preposition belongs logically either,

a) To the relative clause; as, Rom. x. 14 πῶς ἐπικαλέσονται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν, vi. 21 τίνα καρπὸν εἶχετε τότε (viz. τούτων) ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε,² xiv. 21; Jno. xix. 37 (Sept.); Luke v. 25;

¹ Similar to this would be 1 Tim. ii. 10 ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναῖξιν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, if we unite with *Matthies* in resolving ἀλλ' ὃ into ἀλλ' ἐν τούτῳ ὃ πρ. But it is simpler and easier to explain the passage by joining δι' ἔργων with κοσμεῖν verse 9. Had Paul intended to convey the former meaning, he would have expressed himself distinctly by writing ἐν ᾧ πρέπει etc.

² *Reiche* has obviously stated more than the truth in asserting that in all other instances the only demonstrative omitted, is one governed by a verb, and never one gov-

2 Pet. ii. 12; ¹ Soph. Phil. 957; Aristot. rhet. 2, 1, 7; Isocr. Demon. p. 2. Or,

b) To the demonstrative understood; as, Jno. vi. 29 *ἵνα πιστεύσῃτε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος*, xvii. 9; Rom. xiv. 22; 2 Cor. v. 10; xii. 6; Gal. i. 8 f.; Heb. v. 8 (Num. vi. 21). Also Heb. ii. 18 *ἐν ᾧ ᾤέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθεῖς, δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι* ^{6th ed.} might be resolved thus: *ἐν τούτῳ ὃ ᾤέπονθεν . . . δύναται . . . βοηθῆσαι*. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 6, 34 *ἐγγύγνεται εὐνοια πρὸς οὓς ἂν ὑπολάβω εὐνοικῶς ἔχειν πρὸς ἐμέ*, Anab. 1, 9, 25; Hell. 4, 8, 33; Demosth. Con. p. 729 a.; Olynth. I. p. 2; ep. 4 p. 118 b.; Plato, rep. 2, 375 d.; and Phaed. 61 c.; Arrian. Alex. 6, 4, 3; Diog. L. 9, 67; 6, 74. Or,

c) To both clauses; as, 2 Cor. ii. 3 *ἵνα μὴ λύπην ἔχω ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν*, 1 Cor. vii. 39; x. 30; Jno. xi. 6; Rom. xvi. 2 (cf. Isocr. Evag. p. 470 *πλείους ἐν τούτοις τοῖς τόποις διατρίβειν, ἢ παρ' οἷς πρότερον εἰωθότες ἦσαν*. Cic. Agrar. 2, 27). Also 1 Cor. vii. 1, and Phil. iv. 11 may be so construed.

Relative Adverbs, in like manner, often include definite; as, Jno. xi. 32 *ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (i.e. ἐκεῖσε ὅπου), vi. 62; Mark v. 40 *εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον* (cf. Btm. Philoct. p. 107), 1 Cor. xvi. 6; Matt. xxv. 24 *συνάγων ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας* for *ἐκεῖθεν ὅπου*, cf. Thuc. 1, 89. Still more free is the construction in Jno. xx. 19 *τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταί* etc.

It has already been mentioned, that in such condensed sentences (where a Greek would not properly supply a demonstrative, Krü. 124) a comma should not be inserted before the relative. In Jno. vi. 29 a comma would be absurd.

3. In emphatic passages the demonstrative is repeated in connected clauses several times in succession; as, Acts vii. 35 *τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν . . . τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀπέσταλκεν . . . οὗτος ἐξήγαγον . . . οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἶπας . . . οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* etc.; and, in a different spirit, Jno. vi. 42 *οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ . . . πῶς οὖν λέγει οὗτος* etc. See Bornem. bibl. Stud. der sächs. Geisl. I. 66 f., who, among other 151 passages, quotes as parallel Xen. M. 4, 2, 28 *καὶ οἳ τε ἀποτυγχάνοντες τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιθυμοῦσι τούτους ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν βουλευέσθαι, καὶ προίστασθαι τε αὐτῶν τούτους, καὶ τὰς ἐλπίδας τῶν ἀγαθῶν* ^{7th ed.}

erned by a noun; cf. Jno. xviii. 26; Luke xxiii. 41. Besides, were the assertion correct, it would prove nothing against the above explanation, see Fr. Moreover, *ἐφ'* ois might perhaps also be taken in the sense discussed by Weber, Demosth. p. 492.

¹ Ἀγνοεῖν ἐν Porphy. abst. 2, 53. Some also refer to this head Rom. vii. 6, supplying *ἐκεῖνος* (νόμος) before *ἐν ᾧ*; but *ἐν ᾧ* refers back to *ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου*, and *ἀποθάν.* is annexed absolutely to denote the *modus* of *κατηργ.* See Philippi.

ἐν τούτοις ἔχουσι καὶ διὰ πάντα τὰ πάντα πάντων μάλιστα τούτους ἀγαπῶσιν. From Latin cf. Cic. Verr. 3, 9, 23 *hunc* in omnibus stupris, *hunc* in feneratorum expilationibus, *hunc* in impuris conviviis principem adhibebat (Verres). This Anaphora occurs with a relative adjective in Phil. iv. 8 ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἀγνά, ὅσα προσφιλή, ὅσα εὐφημα; cf., further, § 65.

4. It is far more common to repeat οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος in the same clause after the subject, or the predicate if it precedes; the pronoun is inserted immediately before (more rarely after) the verb.

- 173 This occurs when the subject (or predicate) consists of several words and is to be made more perspicuous or emphatic; as, Matt. xxiv. 13 ὁ ὑπομένων εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται, Jno. i. 18 ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο, Mark vii. 15 τὰ ἐκπορευόμενα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνά ἐστι τὰ κοινούντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, vii. 20; xii. 40; 1 Cor. vi. 4 τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τούτους καθίζετε, Rom. vii. 10, 15 f. 19 f.; ix. 6, 8; xiv. 14; Jno. v. 11; 145 xii. 48; Phil. i. 22 etc.; cf. Thuc. 4, 69 (Xen. conv. 8, 33; Ages. 4, 4); Plato, Protag. p. 339 d.; Isocr. Evag. c. 23; Paus. 1, 24, 5; Lucian. fug. 3; Ael. 12, 19, etc. See Schaef. Melet. p. 84; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 78, 144, and Lucian. Alex. p. 7; Siebelis, Pausan. I. 63; Weber, Demosth. 158. As to Latin see Kritz, Sallust. I. 171. (The further strengthening of such emphasis by δὲ—Btm. Demosth. Mid. p. 152; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 252—does not occur in the N. T. Neither do the sacred writers exhibit any trace of that consequent anacoluthon which is not infrequent in the classics—Schwarz, de discipulor. Chr. soloecism. p. 77—; unless one choose to refer the attraction in 1 Pet. ii. 7 to this head.)

Still more frequently are these pronouns thus used after a protasis beginning with a conjunction or a relative; as, Jno. ix. 31 εἰάν τις θεοσεβῆς ᾗ καὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιῇ, τούτου ἀκούει, Jas. i. 23; Matt. v. 19; xii. 50; Phil. iii. 7; iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 2.

The repetition of the demonstrative pronoun in Luke xix. 2 καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἀρχιτελώνης καὶ οὗτος ἦν πλούσιος, is deserving of attention. The meaning is: he was a chief publican and besides (as such) was rich, *isq̄ue* dives fuit (Mtth. 1040); Lchm. has adopted from B the reading καὶ αὐτὸς (ἦν) πλ., which has less to recommend it. Cf., also, Xen. Cyr. 8, 3, 48.

The case is different when, for the sake of perspicuity, in a lengthened sentence, a preceding substantive is again brought under the notice of the reader by means of a pronoun; as, 2 Cor. xii. 2 οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ ... πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων ... εἶτε ἐν σώματι ... ἀπαγόντα τὸν τοιοῦτον 152 etc. (Plato, rep. 8, 398; Xen. C. 1, 3, 15) 1 Cor. v. 3, 5; Acts i. 21 f. 14 cf. § 22, 4, p. 147.

5. A demonstrative pronoun is often placed before *ὅτι*, *ἵνα*, and similar particles, to give special prominence to the clause that follows (particularly in Paul and John); as, 1 Tim. i. 9 *εἰδὼς τοῦτο*, *ὅτι* etc. Acts xxiv. 14 *ὁμολογῶ τοῦτό σοι*, *ὅτι* etc. Rom. vi. 6;¹ 1 Cor. i. 12; xv. 50; 2 Cor. v. 15; x. 7, 11; 2 Thess. iii. 10; Phil. 174 i. 6, 25; Jno. xvii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 20; 1 Jno. i. 5; iii. 11, 23; iv. 9, 10; v. 3, 11, 14; 2 Jno. 6; cf. Plato, Soph. 234 b. So *εἰς τοῦτο* before *ἵνα* Acts ix. 21; Rom. xiv. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 9; Eph. vi. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Jno. iii. 8, *ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι* 1 Jno. iv. 13, *ἐν τούτῳ ἵνα* Jno. xv. 8; 1 Jno. iv. 17 (see Lücke in loc.), *ἐν τούτῳ ἕάν* 1 Jno. ii. 3, *ἐν τούτῳ ὅταν* 1 Jno. v. 2; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 461; Franke, Demosth. p. 40.

Likewise when an Infinitive (Mtth. Eurip. Phoen. 520; Sprachl. 1046) or a noun follows as predicate, a demonstrative is employed for emphasis; as, 2 Cor. ii. 1 *ἔκρινα ἐμαντῶ τοῦτο*, *τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν*, vii. 11 *αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ θεὸν λυπηθῆναι*, 1 Cor. vii. 37; Eph. iv. 17; Jas. i. 27 (cf. Xen. Hell. 4, 1, 2, and Ages. 1, 8; Plat. Hipp. mai. 302 a.; Gorg. 491 d.; Isocr. Evag. c. 3; Porphyry. abstin. 1, 13; Dion. H. VI. 667, and de Thuc. 40, 3; Epict. enchir. 31, 1 and 4; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 261); 2 Cor. xiii. 9 *τοῦτο καὶ εὔχομαι, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν*, 1 Jno. iii. 24; 146 v. 4 (cf. Achill. Tat. 7, 2 *φάρμακον αὐτῷ τοῦτο τῆς . . . λύπης ἢ πρὸς ἄλλον εἰς τὸ παθεῖν κοινωνία*, Plat. rep. 3, 407 a.; Lucian. navig. 3; Eurip. suppl. 510; cf. Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 136; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 466).

Even *εἰς τοῦτο* is so used, as Acts xxvi. 16 *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὥφθην σοι προχειρίσασθαι σε ὑπρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα* etc., and *οὕτως* 1 Pet. ii. 15 (1 Cor. iv. 1), and *ἐντεῦθεν* Jas. iv. 1.

Lastly, a demonstrative is thus prefixed to a participial construction; as, Mark xii. 24 *οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾷσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς* etc., *for this cause . . . because ye know not* etc.; cf. Antiphon 6, 46 *οὐκ ἀπεγράφοντο τούτου αὐτοῦ ἔνεκα, οὐχ ἡγούμενοι με ἀποκτείνειν* etc., see Maetzner, Antiph. p. 219; Schoem. Isaeus p. 370.

The use of the demonstrative pronoun in such expressions as Acts i. 5 *οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας* *after (in) a few days*, is easily explained. It does not depend, as Kühnöl thinks, on a transposition of *πολύς*, but is to be explained like the Latin *ante hos quinque dies*, etc.; cf. in Greek *ὡς δλίγων πρὸ τούτων ἡμερῶν* (Achill. Tat. 7, 14), *οὐ πρὸ πολλῶν τῶνδε ἡμερῶν* (Heliod. 2, 22, 97). *Αὗται ἡμέραι* are, these very days just past; and *ante hos quinque dies* strictly means: before these (reckoning from the present

¹ In Rom. ii. 3 an amplified Voc. intervenes between *τοῦτο* and the clause with *ὅτι*.

time) last past five days. The demonstrative, therefore, connects the 153 period specified with the *present*. Expositors and lexicographers are 7th ed able to explain the force of the demonstrative in Jas. iv. 13 πορευσόμεθα εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν *into such and such a city*, only by a reference to the well-known ὁ δαίνα; but ὅδε is also used by the Greeks in exactly the same way, e.g. Plutarch. Symp. 1, 6, 1 τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν *such and such a day*. [The full and ordinary demonstrative signification, however, is claimed, both for the passage in James and for that in Plutarch, by Bttm. Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 90; and Huther on James, 2nd. ed., agrees with him.]

175 The Plur. ταῦτα is not unfrequently in Greek employed in reference to a *single* object, and stands therefore, strictly taken, for τοῦτο (Plat. Apol. 19 d.; Phaedr. 70 d.; Xen. Cyr. 5, 3, 19; see Schaef. Dion. p. 80; cf. also Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 524; Stallb. Plat. Apol. p. 19 d.; Maetzner, Antiphon p. 153).¹ Instances of this in the N. T. are 3 Jno. 4 (where several Codd. give the correction ταύτης) see Lücke, and also Jno. i. 51; but undoubtedly not Jno. xix. 36, see van Hengel, annotat. p. 85 sq.; in Luke xii. 4 the adverbial phrase μετὰ ταῦτα means *afterwards*. Nearly the same is to be said of the well-known καὶ ταῦτα, *idque*, Heb. xi. 12. On 1 Cor. ix. 15 see Mey.² In 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτα may have a contemptuous secondary signification: καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε, *and such a set*, talis farinae homines (Bhdy. 281; Stallb. Plat. Rival. p. 274); yet perhaps this was far from the apostle's thought, and ταῦτα is frequently used in reference to a series of predicates: *of such a description*, ex hoc genere fuistis; Kypke and Pott in loc. have blended things quite dissimilar.

147 In 1 Jno. v. 20 Lücke thinks he finds a prozeugma of the demonstrative 6th ed pronoun (cf. also Stud. und Kritik. II. S. 147 ff.): οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, καὶ (αὐτῇ) ζωὴ αἰώνιος, — not impossible, but in my opinion unnecessary.

Note. Respecting the *position* of οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος, it must be remarked that the former, from the nature of the case, usually stands *before*, and the latter *after*, the substantive; as, οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. Yet the opposite order also occurs in the case of οὗτος (Matt. xxviii. 15 ὁ λόγος οὗτος, Luke i. 29 etc.) without essential difference of meaning, with ἐκεῖνος (Luke xii. 47; Heb. iv. 11) particularly in the connecting phrases ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ or ὥρᾳ, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ (Gersdorf 433). It must not, however, be imagined that a writer has so committed himself to the *one* arrangement, that the other should be altered when it is confirmed by approved Codd. or by the sense.

¹ *Fritzache*, quæstion. Lucian. p. 126, qualifies this remark as follows: Plur. poni de una re tantummodo sic, si neque ulla emergat ambiguitas et aut universe, non definite quis loquatur, aut una res plurium vi sit prædita.

² In the same way ἐφ' οἷς and ἀπ' ὧν are used in Greek, where the Sing. would suffice. Fr. Rom. I. 299.

§ 24. THE RELATIVE PRONOUN.

154

7th ed.

1. In accordance with the law of attraction (cf. Hm. Vig. 891 sqq. ; Bhdy. 299 ff.),¹ the relative pronoun *ὃς* (never in the N. T. *ὅστις*),² which by reason of the governing verb should stand in the Accusative, is so drawn by the oblique case (Gen. or Dative) of the 176 preceding noun with which it has a logical connection (that of a subordinate with a principal clause), as to pass over into this oblique case. This peculiar construction, which gives a sentence more internal unity and a certain periodic compactness, was frequent even in the Sept., and in the N. T. it regularly occurs (though not everywhere without var.) ; as, Luke ii. 20 *ἐπὶ πάντων οἷς ἤκουσαν*, Jno. ii. 22 (iv. 50) *ἐπίστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν*, Acts iii. 21, 25 ; vii. 17 ; x. 39 ; xvii. 31 ; xx. 38 ; xxii. 10 ; Jas. ii. 5 ; 1 Pet. iv. 11 ; Jno. vii. 31, 39 ; xv. 20 ; xvii. 5 ; Mark vii. 13 ; Luke v. 9 ; xix. 37 ; Matt. xviii. 19 ; 1 Cor. vi. 19 ; 2 Cor. x. 13 ; xii. 21 ; 2 Thess. i. 4 ; Tit. iii. 6 ; Heb. vi. 10 (ix. 20) ; x. 1 ; Eph. i. 8 ; ii. 10 ; Rev. xviii. 6, etc. (in all which cases the comma in the text before the relative is to be rejected, see § 7, 1). Jude 15 *περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἡσέβησαν* deserves particular attention, see § 32, 1, p. 222.

There are, however, passages in which this construction is neglected ; as, Heb. viii. 2 *τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἐπηξεν ὁ κύριος*, and, according to good Codd., Mark xiii. 9 ; Jno. vii. 39 ; iv. 50 ; Tit. iii. 5. Besides, compare the var. in Jno. xvii. 11 ; Heb. vi. 10 ; Acts vii. 16 ; Rev. i. 20. So frequently in the Sept. and the Apocrypha (Wahl, clav. p. 360), likewise in Greek authors ; see Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 30 ; Weber, Dem. 543 ; Krü. 121.

Eph. i. 6 *τῆς χάριτος ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν* (var. *ἐν ᾗ*), iv. 1 *τῆς κλήσεως ἧς* 148 *ἐκλήθητε*, 2 Cor. i. 4 *διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἧς παρακαλούμεθα*,³ where *ἧς* seems 6th ed. to stand for *ᾗ*, appear to transcend the above rule. But these passages may be accounted for by the well-known expressions *κλήσιν καλεῖν, παράκλησιν παρακαλεῖν, χάριω χαριτοῦν, ἀγάπην ἀγαπᾶν* (§ 32, 2), and by the equally well-known construction of the Passive ; see Gieseler in Rosenm.

¹ Cf. also the thorough treatise of *G. T. A. Krüger* (relating more directly to Latin) in his *Untersuch. a. d. Gebiete der lat. Sprachlehre*. 3 Hefte. Braunsch. 1827, 8vo. ; *K. W. Krüger*, in his *Sprachl.* 121, prefers the term *assimilation*.

² The form *ὅστις* occurs in the N. T. only as nominative.

³ Here, however, we may, with *Wahl*, consider the Gen. as dependent on the omitted preposition *διὰ* ; see § 50, 7, p. 421 sq.

Repertor. II. 124.¹ Also in Acts xxiv. 21 φωνῆς ἥς ἐκραξα ἐστὺς etc., probably ἥς is not used for ἡ (φωνῇ κράζειν Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark i. 26; 155 Rev. vi. 10, etc.) cf. Boisson. Nicet. p. 33, but φωνή means *cry, exclamation* 7th ed. (loud utterance); the construction accordingly resolves itself into the phrase φωνῇ κράζειν (Rev. vi. 10 var.), which, though unusual, is not inadmissible; cf. Isa. vi. 4 φωνῆς ἥς ἐκέκραγον. (In Eph. i. 8 ἥς ἐπερίσσευσεν, the verb is to be taken transitively, as γνωρίσας in vs. 9 shows.) That attraction nevertheless may affect even the Dative of the relative (so as 177 to change it into a Gen.) is shown by G. Krüger, as above, 274 f.; cf. Heinichen, Euseb. II. 98 sq. Accordingly Cod. A in 1 Tim. iv. 6 has τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας ἥς παρηκολούθηκας. Many expositors, too, as recently Fr. also, resolve Rom. iv. 17 κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ into κατ. θεοῦ ᾧ ἐπίστ.; but this is not necessary; see 2 below.² On the other hand, Matt. xxiv. 38 ἦσαν ... γαμούντες καὶ ἐγαμίζοντες ἄχρι ἥς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθε Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν is probably contracted from ἄχρι τῆς ἡμ. ἣ εἰσῆλθεν. Similarly Luke i. 20; Acts i. 2, 22. In Lev. xxiii. 15 ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἥς ἂν προσενέγκητε etc. Bar. 1, 19, we find the same attraction of the Dative of the relative when the two clauses are not merged into one; for though ἥς ἡμέρας (*on which day*) also occurs, yet in the Sept. the Dative of time predominates.

2. Sometimes the opposite construction occurs: that is to say, the noun to which the relative refers is drawn into the construction of the relative clause and put in that case in which the governing verb requires the relative to stand. When this occurs, the noun either

a. Precedes the relative clause; as, 1 Cor. x. 16 τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος; Matt. xxi. 42 (LXX.) λίθον ὃν ἠπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη, 1 Pet. ii. 7; Luke xii. 48 παντὶ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολὺ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, probably also Luke i. 72, 73 μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἀγίας αὐτοῦ, ὄρκον ὃν ὤμοσε πρὸς Ἀβραάμ, but probably not Acts x. 36, see below § 62, 3. (cf. Gieseler as above, 126; Krü. 224 f.); Or,

b. As respects position also is incorporated directly into the relative clause; as, Mark vi. 16 ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτός ἐστι, Philem. 10; Luke xix. 37. Likewise Rom. vi. 17 ὑπηκούσατε εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδασχῆς; this may indeed be resolved into 149 εἰς τὸν τύπον διδ. ὃν παρ., an Acc. with a Passive, for ὃς παρεδόθη 6th ed. ὑμῶν—(for a similar attraction affecting the Acc. of a more remote object see Demosth. Mid. 385 c. δίκην ἅμα βουλόμενοι λαβεῖν, ὃν ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐτεθέαντο θρασὺν ὄντα, where ὢν is for ᾧ, i.e. ἐν οἷς,

¹ And so, probably, should be taken Aristoph. Plut. 1044 τάλας ἐγὼ τῆς ὕβρεως ἥς ὀβρίζομαι.

² Cf. Schmid in the Tübing. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1831, II. 137 ff.

to be joined with *θρασ. ὄντα*, and Dion. Hal. 9, 565 *ἀγανάκτησις ὑμῶν περὶ ὃν ὑβρίζεσθε ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων*, Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 b.) — or more simply (as Bornem., Rück., Fr., and others have maintained) *ἰπηκ. (τῷ) τύπῳ διδ. εἰς ὃν παρ.*, since the construction *ἰπακούειν τινί*¹ is the only one admissible here. Some explain even Acts xxi. 16 *ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνι* etc. by 156 attraction: *ἄγ. παρὰ Μνάσωνα . . . παρ' ᾧ ξεν.*, yet see § 31, 5. ^{7th ed.} 178 On 2 Cor. x. 13 see § 59, 7, p. 530.

For both the constructions specified above there are additional parallels: a) Hippocr. morb. 4, 11 *τὰς πηγὰς ἀς ὠνόμασα, αἰτὰι τῷ σώματι* etc., Lysias bon. Arist. p. 649; Aelian. anim. 3, 13; Her. 2, 106; Soph. El. 653, and Trach. 283; Eurip. Bacch. 443 sqq.; Aristoph. Plut. 200; Alciph. 3, 59, the well-known passage of Virgil (Aen. 1, 577) *urbem quam statuo vestra est*, Terent. eunuch. 4, 3, 11; Sen. ep. 53; Wetsten. I. 468. From the Sept. Gen. xxxi. 16 *τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἀφείλετο ὁ θεὸς . . . ἡμῖν ἔσται*, Num. xix. 22, and from the Acta Petri et Pauli ed. Thilo I. 7 *ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν τὴν θλίψιν ἣν ἔχομεν παρὰ Πέτρον*. b) Xen. A. 1, 9, 19 *εἴ τινα ὀρώη κατασκευάζοντα ἧς ἄρχοι χώρας (χώραν ἧς ἄρχοι)*, Soph. Oed. C. 907; El. 1029; Eurip. Orest. 63; Electr. 860, and Hec. 986; Plat. Tim. 49 e.; Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 c.; Plut. Coriol. 9 (Evang. apocr. p. 414; Acta apocr. p. 69); cf. Liv. 9, 2; Terent. Andr. prol. 3. See, in general, Mtth. 1054 f.; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 354.

Under b. would come also Rom. iv. 17 *κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε θεοῦ*, if it were to be resolved into *κατ. θεοῦ, ᾧ ἐπίστ.* This would be an extension of the attraction, become so common, to the Dative, of which no doubt occasional instances occur, Krü. 247 f. (Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 39 *ἦγετο τῶν ἑαυτοῦ τῶν τε πιστῶν, οἷς ἦδετο καὶ ὧν* (i.e. τούτων οἷς) *ἠπίσται πολλούς*); see Fr. Rom. I. 237. But the passage may be explained more simply thus: *κατ. θεοῦ, κατ. οὗ ἐπίστ.* (see above, 1 p. 164). The exposition proposed Bretschn. Lex. man. p. 220 is artificial in more respects than one.

The mere incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause without a change of case occurred: Matt. xxiv. 44 *ἡ ὥρα οὗ δοκεῖτε, ὃ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται* (Gen. ii. 17; Ex. x. 28; xxxii. 34; Num. vi. 13; xxx. 6), Matt. vii. 2 *ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν*, Jno. xi. 6; Mark xv. 12 (Heb. xiii. 11); Luke i. 4. Here belongs, too, Rom. iv. 17, see above. The Greeks generally inserted in the subsequent principal clause a corresponding demonstrative, and separated also the relative by some word from the antecedent, Krü. 123.

Attraction with omission of the (demonstrative) word which occasioned it:

¹ On *ἰπακούειν εἰς* particularly in Josephus, see *Κυπκε*, observatt. II. 167, though exception can be taken to some of his examples.

a. With the intervention of a preposition ; as, Heb. v. 8 ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε, i.e. ἀπὸ τούτων ᾧ (ὧν) ἔπαθε, Rom. x. 14 ; Jno. vi. 29 ; xvii. 9 ; 1 Cor. vii. 1 (Demosth. Euerg. 684 b. ἀγανακτήσασα ἐφ' οἷς ἐγὼ ἐπεπόνθειν, Plat. Cratyl. 386 a. ; Xen. An. 1, 9, 25 ; Arrian. Al. 4, 10, 3 ; Lysias II. 242 ed. Auger.). See § 23, 2. And

b. Without a preposition ; as, Rom. xv. 18 οὐ τολμήσω λαλεῖν τι ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο etc. Acts viii. 24 ; xxvi. 16 (Soph. Phil. 1227 ; Oed. R. 855).
179 Cf. § 23, 2 ; and the same place for attraction with an adverb of place (G. Krü. 302 ff.).

3. Sometimes the relative pronoun agrees in gender and number with the following noun which is predicate in the relative clause (ὅς . . . ἐστὶ) annexed by way of explanation ; (this, too, is a species of attraction, Hm. Vig. 708) : Mark xv. 16 τῆς αὐλῆς, ὃ ἐστὶ πραιτώριον, Gal. iii. 16 τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὃς ἐστὶ Χριστός, 1 Tim. iii. 15 ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ, ἧτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ, Eph. vi. 17 ; i. 14 ; Phil. i. 28 ; Eph. iii. 13 μὴ ἐκκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἧτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν (for ὃ), also 1 Cor. iii. 17 (where Mey., without reason, makes a difficulty about οἵτινες). Cf. also, Rev. iv. 5 ; v. 6, 8 var. On the other hand, Eph. i. 23 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἧτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor. iv. 17 ; Col. i. 24 ; ii. 17.

Some have erroneously referred to this head Col. iii. 5 ἧτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία (ἧτις for ἅτινα, viz. μέλη) ; the reference is only to πλεονεξία (Huther in loc.). In Col. iii. 14 ὃ, the better attested reading, appears to be a pure Neut. without reference to the gender of the preceding or the following noun. On Eph. v. 5 see note 1. In Matt. xxvii. 33, and similar passages, ὃ is *quod* sc. vocabulum. With regard to Heb. ix. 9 expositors are divided in opinion ; but most of them now refer ἧτις to ἡ πρώτη σκηνή verse 8, so that this passage does not fall under the above rule. Commentators differ still more widely in reference to Col. i. 27 ; but it is better to connect ὃς with ὁ πλοῦτος, as the principal noun, than with μυστήριον.

It should seem, then, that the relative conforms to the gender of the following noun mainly when the latter is viewed as the principal subject ; consequently, when the *specific* appellations are given of things, which, in the principal clause, were mentioned in general terms (Mark xv. ; 1 Tim. iii., cf. Pausan. 2, 13, 4 ; Cic. pro Sest. 42, 91 domicilia coniuncta quas urbes dicimus), especially with names of persons (Gal. iii., cf. Cic. legg. 1, 7, 22 animal, *quem* vocamus hominem), or where the relative should have been a Neut. used absolutely (Eph. iii.). On the other hand, the relative

retains the gender of the noun in the principal clause, when the subordinate clause contains an explanatory amplification, a predicate of the principal object (as in Eph. i. ; 1 Cor. iv.) ; (cf. Bremi on Nep. Thrasyb. 2). See, in general, G. Krü. as above, 90 ff., and, for the Latin, Zumpt, *Grammat.* § 372 ; Kritz, *Sallust.* I. 292.

4. The relative appears to be put for the interrogative in a direct question,¹ Matt. xxvi. 50 *ἐταῖρε, ἐφ' ᾧ* (that is, *ἐπὶ τί* Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 1101) *πάρει*. This is an impropriety of declining Hellenism 180 (Schaefer. *Demosth.* V. 285), which Lob. *Phryn.* p. 57 has substantiated as respects other relative pronouns (*Plat. Alcib.* 1 p. 110 c.), 151 and which cannot be thought very surprising when the affinity ^{6th ed.} between the words *qui* and *quis* is considered. This usage is unknown in classic prose. (In *Plat. Men.* 74 d. recent editors, apparently without MS. authority, have substituted *τί*. On *Plat. rep.* 8, 559 a. see Stallb.) But it is not necessary, on this account, to assume (with Mey.) that the above passage contains an aposiopesis, or, with Fr., to take the sentence as an exclamation: *vetus* 158 *sodalis, ad qualem rem perpetranda ades!* By a question Jesus ^{7th ed.} might effectively call the attention of Judas to the wickedness of his design. (It would be more allowable in Mark ix. 11 *λέγοντες· ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς* etc. to regard *ὅτι*, with Lehm., as put for *τί* (that is, *διὰ τί*), just as in *Heliod.* 4, 16 ; 7, 14, quoted by Lob. as above, *ὅστις* is used in a direct question. But *ὅτι* never occurs in the N. T. as an interrogative pronoun (certainly not *Jno.* viii. 25, see § 54, 1), not even in an indirect question. As *ὅτι* immediately follows the words quoted above, it might easily have been written by mistake also before *λέγουσι* for *τί*, see Fr. If *ὅτι*, however, be the true reading, it should rather be taken for *ὅτι because*, see § 53, 10, 5, p. 456.)

Note 1. It is peculiar to Paul to connect sometimes two, three, or more clauses by a repetition of the relative pronoun, even when it refers to different subjects ; as, *Col.* i. 24 f., 28, 29 ; *Eph.* iii. 11, 12 ; 1 *Cor.* ii. 7, cf. 1 *Pet.* ii. 22. Elsewhere the relative in the Sing. is thought to point to a series of nouns, and to be used, as it were, in a collective sense ; as, *Eph.* v. 5 *ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὃς ἐστὶν εἰδωλόλατρης* etc. Cf. *Fritzsche de conformat. crit.* p. 46. But this is arbitrary, and would suppose just such a forced explanation of *Col.* iii. 5 (see above).

Note 2. The relative clause beginning with *ὅς, ὅστις*, is usually placed *after* the clause containing the antecedent ; where, however, the former

¹ *ὅς* in an indirect question occurs in *Soph. Oed. R.* 1068 ; see *Ellendt, Lexic. Soph.* II. 372. Also cf. *Passow*, under the word.

clause is to be made prominent, it is put first (Krü. 123) ; as, 1 Cor. xiv. 37 *ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν ὅτι κυρίου ἐστίν*, Heb. xii. 6 *ὃν ἀγαπᾷ κύριος παιδεύει*, Rom. vi. 2 *οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν*, Mark viii. 34, etc. ; with a demonstrative in the second clause, Phil. iii. 7 *ἅτινα ἦν μοι κέρδη, ταῦτα ἤγγημαι* etc. Jas. ii. 10 ; Jno. xxi. 25 ; xi. 45 ; Matt. v. 39 ; Luke ix. 50 ; Acts xxv. 18 ; 1 Cor. iv. 2 ; Heb. xiii. 11.

Note 3. The Neut. *ὅ* before a whole clause, in the sense of *as to* etc. (like *quod* in Latin), occurs in Rom. vi. 10 *ὅ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ*, Gal. ii. 20 *ὅ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ* etc. cf. Mth. II. 1063. In both passages, 181 however, *ὅ* may also be taken for an objective case : *quod vivit, vita, quam vivit*. See Fr. on Rom. as above.

Note 4. During the reign of empiricism it was believed by many expositors that *ὅς* is used in prose, besides the well-known cases (Mth. 742 f.), for the demonstrative. Now, every beginner knows how to construe such passages ; e.g. 2 Cor. iv. 6 *ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκοτῶν φῶς λάμψαι, ὃς λαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις* etc. In 1 Cor. ii. 9 and Rom. xvi. 27 the construction is anacoluthic.

152 § 25. THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN, AND THE INDEFINITE
6th ed. PRONOUN ΤΙΣ.

1. Not only is the Interrogative Pronoun *τίς, τί* ordinarily used, even in *indirect* questions and after verbs of *knowing, inquiring*, 159 etc., while *ὅστις, ὃ, τι* is never so employed in the N. T. (Matt. xx. 22 ; 1th ed. Luke xxiii. 34 (Mark xiv. 36) Jno. x. 6 ; Acts xxi. 33 ; Rom. viii. 26 ; Col. i. 27, etc. ; cf. Xen. C. 1, 1, 6 ; 1, 3, 17 ; Mem. 1, 6, 4, etc. ; Hm. ad Aeschyl. p. 461 ; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 823), but *τί*, in particular, stands even in cases where the Greeks would certainly have used *ὃ, τι*, so that the interrogative is weakened apparently into the German *was* (Eng. *what*) ; as, Matt. x. 19 *δοθήσεται ὑμῖν . . . τί λαλήσετε quod dicatis*, Luke xvii. 8 *ἐτοιμασον, τί δειπνήσω, para, quod comedam* (not *quid comedam*, which in this connection would hardly be allowable in Latin), cf. Bhdy. 443. "*Ὁ, τι* occurs once, Acts ix. 6. The transition to this usage of *τί* appears in the construction Mark vi. 36 *τί φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσι* (Matt. xv. 32), for which with little difference of meaning *ὃ, τι φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχ.* might have been employed, exactly as in Latin one may say either *non habent quid comedant* or *non hab. quod com.* (Ramshorn, lat. Gramm. 368). In the latter form of expression, *ἔχειν* and *habere* simply convey the notion of having or possessing (that which they might eat, they have not) ; the former comprises the notion of inquiry (accordingly, *habeo quid* must sometimes be directly trans-

lated *I know, what*) : inquiring what they should eat, they have nothing (to eat). Similarly Xen. C. 6, 1, 48 οὐκ ἔχω τί μείζον εἶπω, Hell. 1, 6, 5; Soph. Oed. C. 317 οὐκ ἔχω τί φῶ; see, in general, 182 Heindorf, Cic. N. D. p. 347. (The relative and interrogative are combined in 1 Tim. i. 7 μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἀ λέγουσι μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται *non intelligentes nec quod dicunt nec quid asserant*. So in Greek authors are τί and ὅ,τι coupled in parallel clauses. Cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 248; II. 261; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 641.)

Schleusner, Haab (S. 82 f.), and others, refer to this usage many examples which are of an entirely different nature; that is to say, in which a. τίς retains its interrogative force, and must be rendered in Latin by *quis* or *quid*, as Matt. vii. 9 τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος etc., *quis erit inter vos homo* etc., cf. Matt. xii. 11; Luke xiv. 5; xi. 5 f.; or in which b. τις is not an interrogative, but the indefinite *aliquis*, as 1 Cor. vii. 18 περιτετμημένος τις ἐκλήθη, μὴ ἐπισπάσθω, *was any one called that is circumcised* (I suppose the case), *let him not become uncircumcised*; Jas. v. 13 κακοπαθεῖ τις, προσευχέσθω. It is inaccurately asserted that τις is used here for εἷ τις. See appendix, § 64. In Jas. iii. 13 we must punctuate with Pott, Schott, and others, τίς σοφός . . . ἐν ὑμῖν; δαξάτω etc. Likewise Acts xiii. 25 may be read: τίνα με ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ. Still, I think the usual acceptance of τίνα for ὄντινα not to be rejected; cf. Soph. El. 1167; Callim. epigr. 30, 2.

Τίς is used sometimes, when only two persons or things are spoken 153 of, for the more precise πότερος (which never occurs in the N. T. as an ^{6th ed.} adjective); as, Matt. ix. 5 τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον; xxi. 31 τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησε; Luke vii. 42; xxii. 27; Phil. i. 22. This occurs also in Greek authors (Stallb. Phileb. p. 168), who do not make so nice a distinction 160 between τίς and πότερος as the Romans do between their *quis* and *uter* ^{7th ed.} (though even as respects these last, exceptions are not wanting).

It ought not to be asserted that in phrases such as Luke xv. 26 τί εἶη ταῦτα, Jno. vi. 9; Acts xvii. 20, the Sing. of the interrogative is put for the Plur. The Sing. τί sums up the plurality into one comprehensive whole: *what* (of what sort) are these things (hence also *quid sibi volunt*)? On the other hand, in τίνα ἐστί etc. (cf. Heb. v. 12) there is a definite reference to the plurality: *quae* (*qualia*) *sunt*; cf. Plat. Theaet. 154 e.; 155 c. (Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. 101; Weber, Dem. 192).

The interrogative τί is sometimes placed at the end of the clause; as, Jno. xxi. 21 οὗτος δὲ τίς; The same occurs frequently in the orators with πῶς; Weber, Demosth. 180 sq.

In the N. T. and the Sept. ἵνα τί for *what, wherefore*, is also used as an interrogative; as, Matt. ix. 4 ἵνα τί ὑμεῖς ἐνθυμέσθε πονηρά; xxvii. 46; Luke xiii. 7, etc. The expression is elliptical (as *ut quid* in Latin) for: ἵνα τί γένηται (after a past tense γένοιτο), see Hm. Vig. 849; Lob. Soph. 183

Aj. p. 107, and occurs not unfrequently in Greek authors, particularly the later, Plat. apol. 26 d.; Aristoph. eccles. 718; Arrian. Epict. 1, 24 a. (cf. Ruth i. 11, 21; Sir. xiv. 3; 1 Macc. ii. 7).

2. The indefinite pronoun *τις, τι* is joined to

a. Abstract nouns, in order (among other purposes) to soften their import somewhat; as, Xen. Cyr. 9, 1, 16 *τούτους ἡγείτο ἡ ἀκρατεία τῶν ἢ ἀδικία ἢ ἀμελεία ἀπείναι*—from a *certain* (a species of) incontinence or injustice, etc., Plut. Coriol. 14. Hence, when an unusual or a too bold figure of speech is used; as, Jas. i. 18 *ἀπαρχή τις quaedam* (quasi) *primitiae*, Bttm. I. 579; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis p. 73.

b. Numerals, when the number is to be taken approximately only, and not precisely; as, Acts xxiii. 23 *δύο τινάς some two* (about two), xix. 14, see Schaef. Demosth. III. 269; Mtth. 1080.

c. Adjectives of quality or quantity, for rhetorical emphasis; as, Heb. x. 27 *φοβερά τις ἐκδίκησις terribilis quaedam* (Klotz on Cic. Lael. p. 142, and Nauck in Jahn's Jahrb. Bd. 52 S. 183 f.), a positively (or very) terrible punishment (cf. Lucian. philop. 8 *φοβερόν τι θέαμα*, D. S. 5, 39 *ἐπίπονός τις βίος*, Aeschin. dial. 3, 17; Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 14; 6, 4, 7; Heliod. 2, 23, 99; Lucian. dial. m. 5, 1; Plutarch. Phoc. c. 13, cf. Boisson. Nicet. p. 268); hence Acts viii. 9 *μέγας τις some great* personage (of a man Xen. Eph. 3, 2; Athen. 4, 21, etc.). In these instances *τις* is equivalent to the emphatic *a* (Germ. *ein*: *das war eine Freude, das ist ein Mann*): *that was a joy* (a great joy), *that is a man* (a clever man); cf. Acts v. 36 *λέγων εἶναι τινα ἐαυτόν pretending to be somebody* (of 154 importance); see Bhdy. 440; Krü. 129. To this corresponds 6th ed. *quidam* in Latin, and, where no substantive or adjective is to be made prominent, *aliquis*; as, *aliquem esse* Cic. Att. 3, 15. (On 161 the other hand, *πᾶς τις* does not occur in the N. T. In 1 Cor. ix. 22 7th ed. some would insert it, after a few authorities, instead of *πάντως τινάς*, see Boisson. Eunap. p. 127; but without necessity, and even without critical probability. In Jno. xi. 49 *εἰς τις unus aliquis* may have been used for emphasis.).

In Matt. xx. 20 the Neut. *τι aliquid* may be used with emphasis for *aliquid magni* (see Fr. in loc.), but probably not. On the other hand it must be taken so in the phrase *εἶναι τι* Gal. ii. 6; vi. 3, etc. (the well-known *aliquid esse* in Latin). The emphasis depends on the connection of the passage (cf. Hm. Vig. 731), and is therefore of a rhetorical description. In classic Greek *τι λέγειν, τι πράσσειν*, are especially frequent.

Note. When joined to a substantive, *τις* may stand either *before* or *after*

it; as, *τις ἀνὴρ* and *ἀνὴρ τις* Acts iii. 2; v. 1; x. 1. The latter order is the more usual one in the N. T. On the other hand, it has been doubted 184 (Mith. S. 1081) whether *τις* can stand at the very beginning of a proposition; yet Hm. emend. rat. p. 95 makes no objection to this. In the N. T. compare 1 Tim. v. 24 *τινῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἁμαρτίαι πρόδηλοί εἰσιν . . . τισὶν δὲ* etc. Acts xvii. 18; xix. 31. The abbreviated forms *του*, *τη* (Bttm. I. 301) are not used in the N. T.; they have been unwarrantably introduced in 1 Cor. xv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 6.

§ 26. HEBRAISMS IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN PRONOUNS.

1. Instead of *οὐδεὶς*, *μηδεὶς*, we find sometimes in the N. T., according to the Hebrew idiom (Leusden, diall. p. 107; Vorst, Hebr. p. 529 sq.; Gesen. Lg. 831), *οὐ* (*μὴ*) . . . *πᾶς*, the verb being always connected directly with the negative; as, Matt. xxiv. 22 *οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθῃ πᾶσα σὰρξ*, Rom. iii. 20 *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ*, Luke i. 37 *οὐκ ἀδυνατήσῃ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶν ῥήμα*, 1 Cor. i. 29 *ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσθαι πᾶσα σὰρξ*, etc., cf. also Rev. xxi. 27 *οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινόν*, Acts x. 14 *οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινόν*, Rev. ix. 4 (Judg. xiii. 4; Susan. 27).

On the other hand, *οὐ πᾶς* (*μὴ πᾶς*) without an intervening word denotes (like *non omnis*) *not every*; as, 1 Cor. xv. 39 *οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἡ αὕτη σὰρξ*, Matt. vii. 21 *οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων· κύριε, κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλ. . . ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν*, etc. *not every one that calls me* (readily) *Lord, but* (among such as do so) *only he who doeth the will* etc.;¹ not the mere saying 'Lord' fits for entering 155 the kingdom of heaven, but etc., Acts x. 41. So in the Plur. *οὐ πάντες* *non omnes* Matt. xix. 11; Rom. ix. 6; x. 16.

This distinction is founded in the nature of the case: In the 162 former instance *οὐ* negatives the notion of the verb (something 163 negative is asserted in reference to *πᾶς*: *every man . . . will fail to be justified*; the predicate, will not be justified, applies to every man, i.e. *no man* will be justified);² but in the latter case *οὐ* negatives the notion of *πᾶς*. On the whole, however, this mode 185

¹ I cannot concur in Fr.'s explanation (see also Präliminar. S. 72 f.), according to which *οὐ* is here to be connected with the verb, so as to make the sense, *no Lord-sayer*. The second clause *ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν* by no means excludes *saying* Lord; *ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου* involves, on the contrary, the acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord.

² Gesenius, as above, merely sets down this linguistic phenomenon, without troubling himself to explain it. Ewald, on the contrary (S. 657), has at least indicated its proper acceptance. See even Drusius, ad Gal. ii. 16, and Beza on Matt. xxiv. 22; Rom. iii. 20. Gesenius's distinction between *οὐ πᾶς* and *μὴ πᾶς* I have never comprehended.

of expression is rare, and, as more expressive, appears to have been purposely adopted in the passages in question, (which are mostly aphoristic sayings). It is confined mostly to the rendering of the O. T. כָּל־בְּרִיָּה ; whereas the LXX. as translators have it frequently.¹ (What Georgi, Vind. p. 317, adduces to show that this construction is pure Greek, is wholly irrelevant. In all the passages he quotes, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ belongs to the substantive in the sense of *whole*, as $\mu\eta\delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\ \chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu$, or *full, complete, \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta*.)²

Strictly this Hebraism should be limited to the above expression $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ (\mu\eta)\ \dots\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$; for clauses with $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \dots\ \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ (\mu\eta)$ ³ contain for the most part nothing foreign to the classic idiom,⁴ or the reason is obvious why the writer made choice of this particular turn of expression. 1 Jno. ii. 21 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \psi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ *all falsehood (every lie) is not of the truth* any Greek might have written. Jno. iii. 16 $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'$ etc. (var.) *that every one believing on him may not perish, but* 156 etc. In Eph. v. 5 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\eta}\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\eta}\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma\ \dots\ \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ 6th ed. $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, the apostle had perhaps at the beginning of the sentence an affirmative predicate in mind 163 (Ezek. xli. 9). Only in Eph. iv. 29; Rev. xviii. 22, and perhaps 7th ed. Rev. xxii. 3 $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ would have been more agreeable to a Greek ear.

186 In Matt. x. 29 (Luke xii. 6) occurs $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$ (vel) *unum non, ne unum quidem* (contrasted with $\delta\upsilon\omicron$: *two* for an assarion, and not even *one*, etc.) Matt. v. 18. This construction (with a negative) occurs

¹ For instance, Exod. xii. 16, 44; xx. 10; Deut. v. 14; xx. 16; Judg. xiii. 4; 2 Sam. xv. 11; Ps. xxxiii. 11; cxlii. 2; Ezek. xxxi. 14 (Tob. iv. 7, 19; xii. 11). Quite as frequently, however, they use the good Greek $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \dots\ \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ (\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu)$, Exod. x. 15; Deut. viii. 9; Josh. x. 8; Prov. vi. 35; xii. 21; or just the simple $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, Josh. xxiii. 9.

² If Schleusner means to prove from Cic. Rosc. Amer. 27 and ad fam. 2, 12 that *non omnis* is equivalent to *nullus*, he cannot have looked at these passages.

³ That is, in the *Singular*; for in the *Plural* it is the current mode of expression in classic Greek also. Under this head comes the passage which, to explain the above Hebraism, Weiske, pleon. p. 58, has quoted from Plat. Phaed. 91 e. $\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\eta$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\ \lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, $\acute{\eta}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta'$ $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}$; *do you receive not — i.e. reject — all, or do you receive some and reject others?* How otherwise should this (with simplicity) have been expressed? In the Sept. cf. Num. xiv. 23; Josh. xi. 13; Ezek. xxxi. 14; Dan. xi. 37.

⁴ When a writer attaches the negative to the verb at the beginning of his sentence ($\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$), he has already, in advance, the subject in his mind ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$), and might therefore employ $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. But if he begins with $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, either he has not decided whether to use an affirmative or a negative verb, or it seems to him more suitable to make a negative assertion in reference to *every one* ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu\ \dots\ \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$) than an affirmative in reference to *no one*. The statement, *no believer shall perish*, assumes as it were an apprehension which the speaker means to obviate.

also in Greek authors ; as, Dion. H. comp. 18 (V. 122) *μίαν οὐκ ἂν εὖροι τις σελίδα* etc., antiqq. II. 980, 10 *μία τε οὐ κατελείπετο* (according to Schaef.'s emendation), Plut. Gracch. 9, see Schaef. on this passage and on Dionys. compos. p. 247 ; Erfurdt, Soph. Antig. p. 121. From the Hebr. cf. Exod. x. 19 ; Isa. xxxiv. 16. This construction cannot be called either a Hellenism or a Hebraism ; it is everywhere designed to give greater emphasis than resides in *οὐδεὶς*¹ (properly the same in signification, but weakened by usage).

Luke i. 37 *οὐκ ἀδυνατήσκει παρὰ θεῷ πᾶν ῥῆμα nothing, no thing* (cf. *כִּי* and in Greek *ἔπος*), is doubtless taken from Gen. xviii. 14 of the Sept. Matt. xv. 23 *οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον* is quite simple : *he answered her not a word* (there is no need of *ἐνα* here ; just as we, too, do not emphasize the *α*).² The Greeks, too, could employ the same mode of expression ; and its occurrence in 1 Kings xviii. 21 does not prove it to be a Hebraism.

2. *The one, the other* is expressed sometimes by *εἷς . . . καὶ εἷς*,

a. In antithesis, Matt. xx. 21 ; xxiv. 40 ; xxvii. 38 ; xvii. 4 ; Mark x. 37 ; Jno. xx. 12 ; Gal. iv. 22 (but in Luke xvii. 34 *ὁ εἷς . . . ὁ ἕτερος*, cf. xvi. 13 ; xviii. 10 ; Aesop. 119 de Fur.) (so in Heb. *אֶחָד* Exod. xvii. 12 ; Lev. xii. 8 ; xv. 15 ; 1 Sam. x. 3, etc.), for which Greek authors use *εἷς μὲν, εἷς δέ* or *εἷς μὲν, ὁ δέ* ; see Fischer, ad Leusden. diall. p. 35 ; Mtth. 742. What Georgi, Vind. p. 159 sq., and Schwarz, Comment. p. 421, quote as parallel to the N. T. expression, are more properly enumerations, or calculations of a sum total, e.g. eight, one . . . one . . . one etc.

b. In reciprocal statements ; as, 1 Thess. v. 11 *οικοδομεῖτε εἷς τὸν ἕνα*, 1 Cor. iv. 6. This is rather Aramaic (Hoffmann, Gramm. Syr. p. 330) — hence the Peschito also puts a double *ܐܝܢܐ* for *ἄλληλ*. (Matt. xxiv. 10 ; Jno. xiii. 35) — though not at variance with Greek syntax, Her. 4, 50 *ἐν πρὸς ἐν συμβάλλειν*, Lucian. conscr. hist. 2 *ὡς οὖν ἐν, φασίν, ἐνὶ παραβαλεῖν*, asin. 54. Compare also the phrase *ἐν ἀνθ' ἐνός* (Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 339 ; Bhdy. Dionys. perieg. p. 853) and Kypke II. 339.

As *cuneus cuneum trudit*, some translate Matt. xii. 26 *ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει* the *one* Satan casts out the *other* ; but note the Art. *ὁ . . . ὁ* 6th ed. τὸν. On the other hand, cf. Luke xi. 17. 164

The Heb. construction, *a man . . . to his friend or brother*, is imitated by 7th ed.

¹ Hence likewise *οὐδὲ εἷς* are conjoined, *nemo quisquam, nemo unus* (Matt. xxvii. 14 *οὐδὲ ἐν ῥῆμα ne unum quidem*, Jno. i. 3 ; Rom. iii. 10 ; 1 Cor. vi. 5) *Hm. Vig. 467 ; Weber, Dem. 501* (Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9 ; 4, 1, 14). In the Sept. this occurs frequently (particularly for *אֶחָד* *אֶחָד*), Exod. xiv. 28 ; Num. xxxi. 49. Cf. besides *οὐ . . . ποτέ* 2 Pet. i. 21.

² Nor will any discriminating student think *ἐνα* necessary in the above passage because *εἷς* is elsewhere expressed (Matt. xxi. 24 *ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κατὰ λόγον ἐνα*).

187 the LXX. in Gen. xi. 3; xiii. 11; Judg. vi. 29; Ruth iii. 14; Jer. ix. 20 etc. but does not occur in the N. T.; cf. however, from Sept., Heb. viii. 11 οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον (better πολίτην) αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. —

As to the Hebraistic circumlocution for the pronoun *every* by the repetition of the noun, e.g. ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα, see § 54, 1, p. 463.

CHAPTER III.

THE NOUN.

§ 27. NUMBER AND GENDER OF NOUNS.

1. A Masculine noun in the Singular, with the Article, is often used collectively to denote the whole class; as, Jas. ii. 6 ἡτιμάσατε τὸν πτωχόν (Plur. in 1 Cor. xi. 22), v. 6; Rom. xiv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 18; Matt. xii. 35. This construction is especially common with national names; as, δ' Ἰουδαῖος Rom. iii. 1 (so *Romanus* for *Romani* frequently) Markland, Eurip. suppl. v. 659. The Singular in all such cases presents the distinctive characteristic more exclusively and more forcibly than the Plural, — designating, as the latter does, a multitude of individuals.

Similar to this construction is the use of the Singular to express, in reference to a plurality, an object which belongs to each of the individuals; as, 1 Cor. vi. 19 ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τ. ἁγ. πνεύματος (according to the best Codd.); Mark viii. 17 πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν (Jas. iii. 14; Luke i. 66; 2 Pet. ii. 14, etc.); Matt. xvii. 6 ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν (Luke ii. 31; 2 Cor. iii. 18; viii. 24);¹ Rev. vi. 11 ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς στολή λευκή (Luke xxiv. 4; Acts i. 10?); Eph. vi. 14 περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφύν ὑμῶν etc. This distributive Singular, as it may be called, is frequent in classic Greek; as, Xen. A. 4, 7, 16 εἶχον κνημίδας καὶ κράνη κ. μαχαίριον . . . δόρυ etc. Cyr. 4, 3, 11; Eurip. Cycl. 225; Thuc. 3, 22; 4, 4; 6, 58; Pol. 3, 49, 12; Ael. an. 5, 4; cf. Cic. Rab. 4, 11; Sen. ep. 87. In the Sept. cf. Gen. xlviii. 12; Lev. x. 6; Judg. xiii. 20; Lament. ii. 10; 1 Chron. xxix. 6; see also

¹ The phrases ἀπὸ or πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν or ὑμῶν, κατὰ πρ. πάντων etc. Luke ii. 31; Acts vii. 45; Exod. xxxiv. 11; Deut. iii. 18; vii. 19; viii. 20, etc., I should prefer, however, not to refer to this head, as they had already become adverbial.

testam. patr. p. 565.¹ In the N. T. the Plural is the usual construction in this case (also Luke xxiv. 5; Acts i. 10). See in general Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 264; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 158. 158
6th ed.
165
7th ed.

The collective use of the Singular is not to be extended beyond its natural bounds. In 1 Cor. vi. 5 διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ does not stand for τῆς ἀδελφότητος; moreover, nothing would be gained in this way, since ἀνὰ μέσον *between* requires not a collective whole, but single individuals (the case is different in Matt. xiii. 25). It ought to have run ἀνὰ μέσον ἀδελφοῦ καὶ ἀδελφοῦ (Gen. xxiii. 15), or at least τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ (see Grotius), cf. Pol. 10, 48, 1; or the construction is a concise inaccuracy. Meyer's explanation takes for granted also an expression which is inaccurate as it is without example.

2. Conversely, the Plural of class (masc. or fem.) is used although the predicate refers primarily to only one individual, when the writer wishes to keep the thought somewhat vague; as, Matt. ii. 20 τεθνήκασιν οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου (Herod the Great alone is meant, vs. 19), cf. Exod. iv. 19. See Aesch. Prom. 67; Eurip. Hec. 403; Aeschin. adv. Timarch. 21 and Bremi in loc. Porson, Eur. Phoen. p. 36; Reisig, Conject. in Aristoph. p. 58, and C. L. Roth, gramm. quaest. e C. Tacito. Norimb. 1829, 4to. § 1.

On the other hand, in Matt. ix. 8 ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, the reference certainly is not to Christ alone, but the expression must be taken as actually universal, like Heb. ix. 23. In οἱ λησταί Matt. xxvii. 44 a different tradition from Luke xxiii. 39 must be recognized. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xv. 29 ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν cannot easily be referred to (the dead) Christ (for then it would have been εἰς τοὺς νεκρούς), but (unbaptized) dead men are meant.

The expression τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις Acts xiii. 40; Jno. vi. 45 (ἐν βιβλίῳ τῶν προφητῶν Acts vii. 42) is a general form of quotation, like in *Paul's Epistles*, etc., employed when one does not wish, or is not able, to indicate the passage precisely. Essentially similar is Matt. xxiv. 26 189
ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, opposed to ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, cf. Liv. 1, 3 Silvius casu quodam in silvis natus.

In Matt. xxi. 7 ἐπάνω αὐτῶν probably refers to ἵμῃα. There would, however, be no intrinsic absurdity in referring it to the two animals, any more than the expression ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον, verse 5, is absurd. We also say, loosely, *he sprang from the horses*, though only one of the team, the saddled horse, is meant.

¹ In 1 Thess. i. 7 ἕστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπον πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, the Singular is used quite regularly, as Paul had in view the church as a *whole*. 1 Cor. x. 6, 11; 1 Pet. v. 3 are passages of a different kind, where the Singular would be surprising.

Quite erroneously has the Plural *ἐπιστολαί* in 1 Cor. xvi. 3 been taken for the Singular (Heumann in loc.). Though this Plural may be thus used of a single letter (Schaeff. Plutarch. V. 446; Poppo, Thuc. 1, 132), yet here the words *δι' ἐπιστολῶν* are certainly to be joined to *πέμψω*; and the sending of several letters to different persons is in itself not at all unlikely.

166 3. Not a few nouns which are used by us ordinarily in the
7th ed. Singular, were employed exclusively, or at least predominantly, in
159 the Plural; this is owing to the objects denoted by them having —
8th ed. from a general or from a Grecian or a Biblical point of view — some sensible or ideal manifoldness or comprehensiveness (Krü. 9f.); as, *αἰῶνες* Heb. i. 2 *world* (עֲוֹלָמוֹת), *οὐρανοί coeli* (Schneider, lat. Gr. II. 476) cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2, *τὰ ἅγια the sanctuary* Heb. viii. 2; ix. 8, 12, etc., *ἀνατολαί, δυσμαί* (*East, West*) Matt. viii. 11; xxiv. 27 (Plato, def. 411 b.; epin. 990 a.; D. S. 2, 43; Dio. C. 987, 32; Lucian. peregr. 39), *τὰ δεξιὰ, ἀριστερά, εὐώνυμα, the right, the left* (frequently), *θύραι (fores, folding-door)* Acts v. 19; Jno. xx. 19 (in Greek also *πύλαι*, but *θύραι* is a regular Plural in Acts xvi. 26 f.; Matt. xxiv. 33), *κόλποι bosom* Luke xvi. 23 (22 Sing.) cf. Pausan. 6, 1, 2; Ael. 13, 31; also *τὰ ἱμάτια* of a (single) *upper-garment*, Jno. xix. 23; xiii. 4; Acts xviii. 6; the names of festivals *ἐγκαίνια, γενέσια, ἄζυμα* (*Παναθήναια, Saturnalia*, Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 20), also *γάμοι marriage* Matt. xxii. 2; Luke xii. 36 (cf. Tob. xi. 20); likewise *ὀψώνια* (Germ. Löhnung, soldier's pay) Rom. vi. 23 (Fr. Rom. I. 428), and *ἀργύρια (pieces of money, Shekel-pieces)* Matt. xxvi. 15; xxviii. 12.

When the names of countries or cities are Plural, this is due to their consisting (originally) of several provinces (as *Galliae*) or settlements; as, *Ἀθῆναι, Πάτρα, Φίλιπποι*, probably also *τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα*.¹

Lastly, nouns denoting a feeling, disposition, or state, express in the Plural the modes or acts in which the feeling, etc. manifests itself; as, 1 Pet. ii. 1 *ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν κακίαν . . . κ. ὑποκρίσεις κ. φθόνους κ. πάσας καταλαλιάς*, 2 Cor. xii. 20 *ἔρις, ζήλος, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι, καταλαλῖαι, ψιθυρισμοί, φυσιώσεις, ἀκαταστασίαι*, 2 Cor. xi. 23 *ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις*, Eph. vi. 190 11; Gal. v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Jas. ii. 1 (2 Cor. ix. 6) *Jude* 13; 1 Cor. vii. 2; Fr. Rom. III. 6; Kritz, Sallust. I. 76. So *οἰκτιρμοί*, *ἔλεος* is more common than the Singular (only in Col. iii. 12 var.). Here belongs also Eph. ii. 3 *θελήματα τῆς σαρκός*. See, in general,

¹ Cf. Nöbbe, schedae Ptolem. I. 22.

Jacobs, Act. philol. Monac. I. 154 sq.; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis p. 75 sq.; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 368; Heinichen, Euseb. III. 18 sq.; Bhdy. 62 f.

The Plural αἵματα Jno. i. 13 of blood as generative matter, has a direct parallel only in Eurip. Ion. 693 in the poetic language; but it is as easily accounted for in reference to a fluid as τὰ ὕδατα and τὰ γάλακτα Plat. legg. 10, 887 d. In Rev. xviii. 24 αἵματα is a real Plural, and accordingly does not come under the above rule;—a remark true also of αἱ γραφαί, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, αἱ διαθήκαι Rom. ix. 4; Eph. ii. 12 (the covenants which God in patriarchal times repeatedly renewed with Abraham, Jacob, through Moses, cf. Wisd. xii. 21; 2 Macc. viii. 15). Similar is ἐπαγγελία in Heb. vii. 6. A Hebraistic *Plur. majest.* is not to be assumed in these words, nor in Jno. ix. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 1, 7 or Heb. ix. 23, where the statements are general. Τὰ σάββατα when only the weekly day of rest is meant, Matt. 23th ed. xii. 1; Luke iv. 16, etc., is either a transfer of the Aramaean form סַבְּבַת, or framed after the analogy of names of festivals. More easily might ἅγια ἁγίων, Heb. ix. 3, denoting the most holy place of the temple at Jerusalem, be pronounced a *Plur. excell.*, unless, with Erasmus and others, we prefer the accentuation ἁγία ἁγίων (cf. δειλαία δειλαίων Soph. El. 839). However, 160 though this portion of the Israelitish sanctuary is mentioned in the 5th ed. Pentateuch under the designation τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων (Exod. xxvi. 33; Num. iv. 4), cf. Joseph. Antt. 3, 6, 4, yet in 1 Kings viii. 6 the holy of holies is actually called τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. Cf. the Latin *penetralia*, *adyta* (Vir. Aen. 2, 297).

In reference to Phil. ii. 6 τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, where ἴσα is used adverbially, compare the classic usage Iliad. 5, 71; Odys. 1, 432; 15, 520; Soph. Oed. B. 1179; Thuc. 3, 14; Philostr. Ap. 8, 26, etc. See Reisig, Oed. Col. 526.

4. The Dual of nouns—except the numeral δύο—does not occur in the N. T., but in its stead only the Plural is used (with δύο in Matt. iv. 18; xviii. 9; xxvi. 37; Jno. iv. 40; Acts xii. 6, etc.); likewise in later Greek, generally, the dual-form is rare. Only in Rev. xii. 14 τρέφεται καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἡμῖν καιροῦ does the Plural of itself denote *two years*; this, however, is an imitation of the Chaldee נִשְׁמָרָא דַּן. vii. 25 in the Greek versions, and in this connection it may be remarked that the Chaldee regularly has no dual (my Chald. Grammat. S. 77). Accordingly the Plural, placed between *one* year and *half* a year, was allowably made to signify *two*. In later Greek, χρόνος, χρόνοι, came more and more to signify *year*, *years*. See also Evang. apoc. p. 60, 61; Epiphan. Mon. 29, 28.

Bornem. supposes he has found a trace of the Dual in Acts xv. 12 in 191 the reading ἐξηγουμένῳ (ν is added above the line) of one Cod. from which

clause is to be made prominent, it is put first (Krü. 123) ; as, 1 Cor. xiv. 37 ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν ὅτι κυρίου ἐστίν, Heb. xii. 6 ὃν ἀγαπᾷ κύριος παιδεύει, Rom. vi. 2 οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἐτι ζήσομεν, Mark viii. 34, etc. ; with a demonstrative in the second clause, Phil. iii. 7 ἅτινα ἦν μοι κέρδη, ταῦτα ἤγημαι etc. Jas. ii. 10 ; Jno. xxi. 25 ; xi. 45 ; Matt. v. 39 ; Luke ix. 50 ; Acts xxv. 18 ; 1 Cor. iv. 2 ; Heb. xiii. 11.

Note 3. The Neut. ὃ before a whole clause, in the sense of *as to* etc. (like *quod* in Latin), occurs in Rom. vi. 10 ὃ δὲ ζῆ, ζῆ τῷ θεῷ, Gal. ii. 20 ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ etc. cf. Mtth. II. 1063. In both passages, 181 however, ὃ may also be taken for an objective case : *quod vivit, vita, quam vivit*. See Fr. on Rom. as above.

Note 4. During the reign of empiricism it was believed by many expositors that ὅς is used in prose, besides the well-known cases (Mtth. 742 f.), for the demonstrative. Now, every beginner knows how to construe such passages ; e.g. 2 Cor. iv. 6 ὃ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψαι, ὃς λαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις etc. In 1 Cor. ii. 9 and Rom. xvi. 27 the construction is anacoluthic.

152 § 25. THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN, AND THE INDEFINITE PRONOUN ΤΙΣ.

1. Not only is the Interrogative Pronoun τίς, τί ordinarily used, even in *indirect* questions and after verbs of *knowing, inquiring*, 159 etc., while ὅστις, ὅ, τι is never so employed in the N. T. (Matt. xx. 22 ; 7th ed. Luke xxiii. 34 (Mark xiv. 36) Jno. x. 6 ; Acts xxi. 33 ; Rom. viii. 26 ; Col. i. 27, etc. ; cf. Xen. C. 1, 1, 6 ; 1, 3, 17 ; Mem. 1, 6, 4, etc. ; Hm. ad Aeschyl. p. 461 ; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 823), but τί, in particular, stands even in cases where the Greeks would certainly have used ὅ, τι, so that the interrogative is weakened apparently into the German *was* (Eng. *what*) ; as, Matt. x. 19 δοθήσεται ὑμῖν . . . τί λαλήσετε *quod dicatis*, Luke xvii. 8 ἐτοίμασον, τί δειπνήσω, *para, quod comedam* (not *quid comedam*, which in this connection would hardly be allowable in Latin), cf. Bhdy. 443. "Ο, τι occurs once, Acts ix. 6. The transition to this usage of τί appears in the construction Mark vi. 36 τί φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσι (Matt. xv. 32), for which with little difference of meaning ὅ, τι φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχ. might have been employed, exactly as in Latin one may say either *non habent quid comedant* or *non hab. quod com.* (Ramshorn, lat. Gramm. 368). In the latter form of expression, ἔχειν and *habere* simply convey the notion of having or possessing (that which they might eat, they have not) ; the former comprises the notion of inquiry (accordingly, *habeo quid* must sometimes be directly trans-

lated *I know, what*) : inquiring what they should eat, they have nothing (to eat). Similarly Xen. C. 6, 1, 48 οὐκ ἔχω τί μείζον εἶπω, Hell. 1, 6, 5; Soph. Oed. C. 317 οὐκ ἔχω τί φῶ; see, in general, 182 Heindorf, Cic. N. D. p. 347. (The relative and interrogative are combined in 1 Tim. i. 7 μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἀ λέγουσι μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαίουνται non intelligentes nec quod dicunt nec quid asserant. So in Greek authors are τί and ὅ,τι coupled in parallel clauses. Cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 248; II. 261; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 641.)

Schleusner, Haab (S. 82 f.), and others, refer to this usage many examples which are of an entirely different nature; that is to say, in which a. τίς retains its interrogative force, and must be rendered in Latin by *quis* or *quid*, as Matt. vii. 9 τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος etc., *quis erit inter vos homo* etc., cf. Matt. xii. 11; Luke xiv. 5; xi. 5 f.; or in which b. τις is not an interrogative, but the indefinite *aliquis*, as 1 Cor. vii. 18 περιτετμημένος τις ἐκλήθη, μὴ ἐπισπάσθω, *was any one called that is circumcised* (I suppose the case), *let him not become uncircumcised*; Jas. v. 13 κακοπαθεῖ τις, προσευξέσθω. It is inaccurately asserted that τις is used here for εἷ τις. See appendix, § 64. In Jas. iii. 13 we must punctuate with Pott, Schott, and others, τίς σοφὸς . . . ἐν ὑμῖν; δεξάτω etc. Likewise Acts xiii. 25 may be read: τίνα με ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ. Still, I think the usual acceptance of τίνα for ὄντινα not to be rejected; cf. Soph. El. 1167; Callim. epigr. 30, 2.

Τίς is used sometimes, when only two persons or things are spoken 153 of, for the more precise *πότερος* (which never occurs in the N. T. as an ^{6th ed.} adjective); as, Matt. ix. 5 τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον; xxi. 31 τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησε; Luke vii. 42; xxii. 27; Phil. i. 22. This occurs also in Greek authors (Stallb. Phileb. p. 168), who do not make so nice a distinction 160 between τίς and πότερος as the Romans do between their *quis* and *uter* ^{7th ed.} (though even as respects these last, exceptions are not wanting).

It ought not to be asserted that in phrases such as Luke xv. 26 τί εἴη ταῦτα, Jno. vi. 9; Acts xvii. 20, the Sing. of the interrogative is put for the Plur. The Sing. τί sums up the plurality into one comprehensive whole: *what* (of what sort) are these things (hence also *quid sibi volunt*)? On the other hand, in τίνα ἐστὶ etc. (cf. Heb. v. 12) there is a definite reference to the plurality: *quae* (qualia) *sunt*; cf. Plat. Theaet. 154 e.; 155 c. (Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. 101; Weber, Dem. 192).

The interrogative τί is sometimes placed at the end of the clause; as, Jno. xxi. 21 οὗτος δὲ τί; The same occurs frequently in the orators with πῶς; Weber, Demosth. 180 sq.

In the N. T. and the Sept. ἵνα τί for *what, wherefore*, is also used as an interrogative; as, Matt. ix. 4 ἵνα τί ὑμεῖς ἐνθυμείσθε πονηρά; xxvii. 46; Luke xiii. 7, etc. The expression is elliptical (as *ut quid* in Latin) for: ἵνα τί γένηται (after a past tense γένοιτο), see Hm. Vig. 849; Lob. Soph. 183

Aj. p. 107, and occurs not unfrequently in Greek authors, particularly the later, Plat. apol. 26 d.; Aristoph. eccles. 718; Arrian. Epict. 1, 24 a. (cf. Ruth i. 11, 21; Sir. xiv. 3; 1 Macc. ii. 7).

2. The indefinite pronoun *τις*, *τι* is joined to

a. Abstract nouns, in order (among other purposes) to soften their import somewhat; as, Xen. Cyr. 9, 1, 16 *τούτους ἡγγέτο ἡ ἀκρατεία τινὶ ἢ ἀδικία ἢ ἀμελεία ἀπείναι*—from a *certain* (a species of) incontinence or injustice, etc., Plut. Coriol. 14. Hence, when an unusual or a too bold figure of speech is used; as, Jas. i. 18 *ἀπαρχή τις quaedam* (quasi) *primitiae*, Bttm. I. 579; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis p. 73.

b. Numerals, when the number is to be taken approximately only, and not precisely; as, Acts xxiii. 23 *δύο τινάς some two* (about two), xix. 14, see Schaef. Demosth. III. 269; Mtth. 1080.

c. Adjectives of quality or quantity, for rhetorical emphasis; as, Heb. x. 27 *φοβερὰ τις ἐδίκησις terribilis quaedam* (Klotz on Cic. Lael. p. 142, and Nauck in Jahn's Jahrb. Bd. 52 S. 183 f.), a positively (or very) terrible punishment (cf. Lucian. philop. 8 *φοβερόν τι θέαμα*, D. S. 5, 39 *ἐπίτονος τις βίος*, Aeschin. dial. 3, 17; Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 14; 6, 4, 7; Heliod. 2, 23, 99; Lucian. dial. m. 5, 1; Plutarch. Phoc. c. 13, cf. Boisson. Nicet. p. 268); hence Acts viii. 9 *μέγας τις some great* personage (of a man Xen. Eph. 3, 2; Athen. 4, 21, etc.). In these instances *τις* is equivalent to the emphatic *a* (Germ. *ein*: *das war eine Freude, das ist ein Mann*): *that was a joy* (a great joy), *that is a man* (a clever man); cf. Acts v. 36 *λέγων εἶναι τινα ἐαυτὸν pretending to be somebody* (of 154 importance); see Bhdy. 440; Krü. 129. To this corresponds 6th ed. *quidam* in Latin, and, where no substantive or adjective is to be made prominent, *aliquis*; as, *aliquem esse* Cic. Att. 3, 15. (On 161 the other hand, *πᾶς τις* does not occur in the N. T. In 1 Cor. ix. 22 7th ed. some would insert it, after a few authorities, instead of *πάντας τινάς*, see Boisson. Eunap. p. 127; but without necessity, and even without critical probability. In Jno. xi. 49 *εἰς τις unus aliquis* may have been used for emphasis.).

In Matt. xx. 20 the Neut. *τι* *aliquid* may be used with emphasis for *aliquid magni* (see Fr. in loc.), but probably not. On the other hand it must be taken so in the phrase *εἶναι τι* Gal. ii. 6; vi. 3, etc. (the well-known *aliquid esse* in Latin). The emphasis depends on the connection of the passage (cf. Hm. Vig. 731), and is therefore of a rhetorical description. In classic Greek *τὶ λέγειν*, *τὶ πράσσειν*, are especially frequent.

Note. When joined to a substantive, *τις* may stand either *before* or *after*

it; as, *τις ἀνὴρ* and *ἀνὴρ τις* Acts iii. 2; v. 1; x. 1. The latter order is the more usual one in the N. T. On the other hand, it has been doubted 184 (Mtth. S. 1081) whether *τις* can stand at the very beginning of a proposition; yet Hm. emend. rat. p. 95 makes no objection to this. In the N. T. compare 1 Tim. v. 24 *τινῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἁμαρτίαι πρόδηλοί εἰσιν . . . τισὶν δὲ* etc. Acts xvii. 18; xix. 31. The abbreviated forms *του*, *τω* (Bttm. I. 301) are not used in the N. T.; they have been unwarrantably introduced in 1 Cor. xv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 6.

§ 26. HEBRAISMS IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN PRONOUNS.

1. Instead of *οὐδεὶς*, *μηδεὶς*, we find sometimes in the N. T., according to the Hebrew idiom (Leusden, diall. p. 107; Vorst, Hebr. p. 529 sq.; Gesen. Lg. 831), *οὐ (μὴ) . . . πᾶς*, the verb being always connected directly with the negative; as, Matt. xxiv. 22 *οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθῃ πᾶσα σὰρξ*, Rom. iii. 20 *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ*, Luke i. 37 *οὐκ ἀδυνατήσῃ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶν ῥῆμα*, 1 Cor. i. 29 *ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσθαι πᾶσα σὰρξ*, etc., cf. also Rev. xxi. 27 *οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινόν*, Acts x. 14 *οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινόν*, Rev. ix. 4 (Judg. xiii. 4; Susan. 27).

On the other hand, *οὐ πᾶς (μὴ πᾶς)* without an intervening word denotes (like *non omnis*) *not every*; as, 1 Cor. xv. 39 *οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἡ αὐτὴ σὰρξ*, Matt. vii. 21 *οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων· κύριε, κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλ. . . ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν*, etc. *not every one that calls me (readily) Lord, but (among such as do so) only he who doeth the will* etc.;¹ not the mere saying 'Lord' fits for entering 155 the kingdom of heaven, but etc., Acts x. 41. So in the Plur. *οὐ πάντες* *non omnes* Matt. xix. 11; Rom. ix. 6; x. 16.

This distinction is founded in the nature of the case: In the 162 former instance *οὐ* negatives the notion of the verb (something *negative* is asserted in reference to *πᾶς*: *every man . . . will fail to be justified*; the predicate, will not be justified, applies to every man, i.e. *no man* will be justified);² but in the latter case *οὐ* negatives the notion of *πᾶς*. On the whole, however, this mode 185

¹ I cannot concur in Fr.'s explanation (see also Präliminar. S. 72 f.), according to which *οὐ* is here to be connected with the verb, so as to make the sense, *no Lord-sayer*. The second clause *ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν* by no means excludes *saying* Lord; *ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου* involves, on the contrary, the acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord.

² Gesenius, as above, merely sets down this linguistic phenomenon, without troubling himself to explain it. Ewald, on the contrary (S. 657), has at least indicated its proper acceptance. See even Drusus, ad Gal. ii. 16, and Beza on Matt. xxiv. 22; Rom. iii. 20. Gesenius's distinction between *οὐ πᾶς* and *μὴ πᾶς* I have never comprehended.

of expression is rare, and, as more expressive, appears to have been purposely adopted in the passages in question, (which are mostly aphoristic sayings). It is confined mostly to the rendering of the O. T. כָּל־אֶחָד ; whereas the LXX. as translators have it frequently.¹ (What Georgi, Vind. p. 317, adduces to show that this construction is pure Greek, is wholly irrelevant. In all the passages he quotes, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ belongs to the substantive in the sense of *whole*, as $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον, or *full, complete, πᾶσα ἀνάγκη*.)²

Strictly this Hebraism should be limited to the above expression οὐ (μή) . . . πᾶς; for clauses with πᾶς . . . οὐ (μή)³ contain for the most part nothing foreign to the classic idiom,⁴ or the reason is obvious why the writer made choice of this particular turn of expression. 1 Jno. ii. 21 πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν *all falsehood (every lie) is not of the truth* any Greek might have written. Jno. iii. 16 ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' etc. (var.) *that every one believing on him may not perish, but* 156 etc. In Eph. v. 5 πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης . . . οὐκ ἔχει 6th ed. κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the apostle had perhaps at the beginning of the sentence an affirmative predicate in mind 163 (Ezek. xlv. 9). Only in Eph. iv. 29; Rev. xviii. 22, and perhaps 7th ed. Rev. xxii. 3 οὐδέν would have been more agreeable to a Greek ear.

186 In Matt. x. 29 (Luke xii. 6) occurs ἐν ἑξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται (vel) unum non, ne unum quidem (contrasted with δύο: *two* for an assarion, and *not even one*, etc.) Matt. v. 18. This construction (with a negative) occurs

¹ For instance, Exod. xii. 16, 44; xx. 10; Deut. v. 14; xx. 16; Judg. xiii. 4; 2 Sam. xv. 11; Ps. xxxiii. 11; cxlii. 2; Ezek. xxxi. 14 (Tob. iv. 7, 19; xii. 11). Quite as frequently, however, they use the good Greek οὐ . . . οὐδέ (οὐδέ), Exod. x. 15; Deut. viii. 9; Josh. x. 8; Prov. vi. 35; xii. 21; or just the simple οὐδέ, Josh. xxiii. 9.

² If Schleusner means to prove from Cic. Rosc. Amer. 27 and ad famil. 2, 12 that *non omnis* is equivalent to *nullus*, he cannot have looked at these passages.

³ That is, in the *Singular*; for in the *Plural* it is the current mode of expression in classic Greek also. Under this head comes the passage which, to explain the above Hebraism, Weiske, pleon. p. 58, has quoted from Plat. Phaed. 91 e. $\text{πότερον, ἔφη, πάντας τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν λόγους οὐκ ἀποδέχισθε, ἢ τοὺς μὲν, τοὺς δ' οὐ;}$ *do you receive not — i.e. reject — all, or do you receive some and reject others?* How otherwise should this (with simplicity) have been expressed? In the Sept. cf. Num. xiv. 23; Josh. xi. 13; Ezek. xxxi. 14; Dan. xi. 37.

⁴ When a writer attaches the negative to the verb at the beginning of his sentence (οὐ δικαιωθήσεται), he has already, in advance, the subject in his mind (πᾶς), and might therefore employ οὐδέ. But if he begins with πᾶς, either he has not decided whether to use an affirmative or a negative verb, or it seems to him more suitable to make a negative assertion in reference to *every one* (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων . . . οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται) than an affirmative in reference to *no one*. The statement, *no believer shall perish*, assumes as it were an apprehension which the speaker means to obviate.

also in Greek authors; as, Dion. H. comp. 18 (V. 122) *μίαν οὐκ ἂν εὖροι τις σελίδα* etc., antiq. II. 980, 10 *μία τε οὐ κατελείπετο* (according to Schaef.'s emendation), Plut. Gracch. 9, see Schaef. on this passage and on Dionys. compos. p. 247; Erfurdt, Soph. Antig. p. 121. From the Hebr. cf. Exod. x. 19; Isa. xxxiv. 16. This construction cannot be called either a Hellenism or a Hebraism; it is everywhere designed to give greater emphasis than resides in *οὐδέις*¹ (properly the same in signification, but weakened by usage).

Luke i. 37 *οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ θεῷ πᾶν ῥήμα* *nothing, no thing* (cf. *כִּי־יִשְׁלַח* and in Greek *ἔπος*), is doubtless taken from Gen. xviii. 14 of the Sept. Matt. xv. 23 *οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον* is quite simple: *he answered her not a word* (there is no need of *ἓνα* here; just as we, too, do not emphasize the α).² The Greeks, too, could employ the same mode of expression; and its occurrence in 1 Kings xviii. 21 does not prove it to be a Hebraism.

2. *The one, the other* is expressed sometimes by *εἰς . . . καὶ εἰς*,

a. In antithesis, Matt. xx. 21; xxiv. 40; xxvii. 38; xvii. 4; Mark x. 37; Jno. xx. 12; Gal. iv. 22 (but in Luke xvii. 34 *ὁ εἰς . . . ὁ ἕτερος*, cf. xvi. 13; xviii. 10; Aesop. 119 de Fur.) (so in Heb. *וְאֶחָד* Exod. xvii. 12; Lev. xii. 8; xv. 15; 1 Sam. x. 3, etc.), for which Greek authors use *εἰς μὲν, εἰς δέ* or *εἰς μὲν, ὁ δέ*; see Fischer, ad Leusden. diall. p. 35; Mtth. 7+2. What Georgi, Vind. p. 159 sq., and Schwarz, Comment. p. 421, quote as parallel to the N. T. expression, are more properly enumerations, or calculations of a sum total, e.g. eight, one . . . one . . . one etc.

b. In reciprocal statements; as, 1 Thess. v. 11 *οικοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἓνα*, 1 Cor. iv. 6. This is rather Aramaic (Hoffmann, Gramm. Syr. p. 330) — hence the Peschito also puts a double *ܐܝܢܐ* for *ἄλληλ*. (Matt. xxiv. 10; Jno. xiii. 35) — though not at variance with Greek syntax, Her. 4, 50 *ἐν πρὸς ἐν συμβάλλειν*, Lucian. conscr. hist. 2 *ὡς οὖν ἐν, φασίν, ἐνὶ παραβαλεῖν*, asin. 54. Compare also the phrase *ἐν ἀνθ' ἐνός* (Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 339; Bhdy. Dionys. perieg. p. 853) and Kypke II. 339.

As *cuneus cuneum trudit*, some translate Matt. xii. 26 *ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν 157 σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει* the *one* Satan casts out the *other*; but note the Art. *ὁ . . . 6th ed. τὸν*. On the other hand, cf. Luke xi. 17. 164

The Heb. construction, *a man . . . to his friend* or *brother*, is imitated by 7th ed.

¹ Hence likewise *οὐδὲ εἰς* are conjoined, *nemo quisquam, nemo unus* (Matt. xxvii. 14 *οὐδὲ ἓν ῥήμα* ne unum quidem, Jno. i. 3; Rom. iii. 10; 1 Cor. vi. 5) *Hm. Vig. 467; Weber, Dem. 501* (Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9; 4, 1, 14). In the Sept. this occurs frequently (particularly for *וְאֶחָד* *אֶחָד*), Exod. xiv. 28; Num. xxxi. 49. Cf. besides *οὐ . . . ποτέ* 2 Pet. i. 21.

² Nor will any discriminating student think *ἓνα* necessary in the above passage because *εἰς* is elsewhere expressed (Matt. xxi. 24 *ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κατὰ λόγον ἓνα*).

187 the LXX. in Gen. xi. 3; xiii. 11; Judg. vi. 29; Ruth iii. 14; Jer. ix. 20 etc. but does not occur in the N. T.; cf. however, from Sept., Heb. viii. 11 οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον (better πολίτην) αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. —

As to the Hebraistic circumlocution for the pronoun *every* by the repetition of the noun, e.g. ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα, see § 54, 1, p. 463.

CHAPTER III.

THE NOUN.

§ 27. NUMBER AND GENDER OF NOUNS.

1. A Masculine noun in the Singular, with the Article, is often used collectively to denote the whole class; as, Jas. ii. 6 ἡτιμάσατε τὸν πτωχόν (Plur. in 1 Cor. xi. 22), v. 6; Rom. xiv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 18; Matt. xii. 35. This construction is especially common with national names; as, ὁ Ἰουδαῖος Rom. iii. 1 (so *Romanus* for *Romani* frequently) Markland, Eurip. suppl. v. 659. The Singular in all such cases presents the distinctive characteristic more exclusively and more forcibly than the Plural,—designating, as the latter does, a multitude of individuals.

Similar to this construction is the use of the Singular to express, in reference to a plurality, an object which belongs to each of the individuals; as, 1 Cor. vi. 19 ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τ. ἁγ. πνεύματος (according to the best Codd.); Mark viii. 17 πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν (Jas. iii. 14; Luke i. 66; 2 Pet. ii. 14, etc.); Matt. xvii. 6 ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν (Luke ii. 31; 2 Cor. iii. 18; viii. 24);¹ Rev. vi. 11 ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς στολὴ λευκὴ (Luke xxiv. 4; Acts i. 10?); Eph. vi. 14 περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὁσφύν ὑμῶν etc. This distributive Singular, as it may be called, is frequent in classic Greek; as, Xen. A. 4, 7, 16 εἶχον κνημίδας καὶ κράνη κ. μαχαίριον . . . δόρυ etc. Cyr. 4, 3, 11; Eurip. Cycl. 225; Thuc. 3, 22; 4, 4; 6, 58; Pol. 3, 49, 12; Ael. an. 5, 4; cf. Cic. Rab. 4, 11; Sen. ep. 87. In the Sept. cf. Gen. xlviii. 12; Lev. x. 6; Judg. xiii. 20; Lament. ii. 10; 1 Chron. xxix. 6; see also

¹ The phrases ἀπὸ or πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν or ὑμῶν, κατὰ πρ. πάντων etc. Luke ii. 31; Acts vii. 45; Exod. xxxiv. 11; Deut. iii. 18; vii. 19; viii. 20, etc., I should prefer, however, not to refer to this head, as they had already become adverbial.

testam. patr. p. 565.¹ In the N. T. the Plural is the usual construction in this case (also Luke xxiv. 5; Acts i. 10). See in general Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 264; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 158.

158

6th ed.

165

7th ed.

The collective use of the Singular is not to be extended beyond its natural bounds. In 1 Cor. vi. 5 διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ does not stand for τῆς ἀδελφότητος; moreover, nothing would be gained in this way, since ἀνὰ μέσον *between* requires not a collective whole, but single individuals (the case is different in Matt. xiii. 25). It ought to have run ἀνὰ μέσον ἀδελφοῦ καὶ ἀδελφοῦ (Gen. xxiii. 15), or at least τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ (see Grotius), cf. Pol. 10, 48, 1; or the construction is a concise inaccuracy. Meyer's explanation takes for granted also an expression which is inaccurate as it is without example.

2. Conversely, the Plural of class (masc. or fem.) is used although the predicate refers primarily to only one individual, when the writer wishes to keep the thought somewhat vague; as, Matt. ii. 20 τεθνήκασιν οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου (Herod the Great alone is meant, vs. 19), cf. Exod. iv. 19. See Aesch. Prom. 67; Eurip. Hec. 403; Aeschin. adv. Timarch. 21 and Bremi in loc. Porson, Eur. Phoen. p. 36; Reisig, Conject. in Aristoph. p. 58, and C. L. Roth, gramm. quaest. e C. Tacito. Norimb. 1829, 4to. § 1.

On the other hand, in Matt. ix. 8 ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἔξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, the reference certainly is not to Christ alone, but the expression must be taken as actually universal, like Heb. ix. 23. In οἱ λησταί Matt. xxvii. 44 a different tradition from Luke xxiii. 39 must be recognized. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xv. 29 ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν cannot easily be referred to (the dead) Christ (for then it would have been εἰς τοὺς νεκρούς), but (unbaptized) dead men are meant.

The expression τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις Acts xiii. 40; Jno. vi. 45 (ἐν βιβλίῳ τῶν προφητῶν Acts vii. 42) is a general form of quotation, like in *Paul's Epistles*, etc., employed when one does not wish, or is not able, to indicate the passage precisely. Essentially similar is Matt. xxiv. 26 ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, opposed to ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, cf. Liv. 1, 3 Silvius casu quodam in silvis natus.

In Matt. xxi. 7 ἐπάνω αὐτῶν probably refers to ἵμᾱτια. There would, however, be no intrinsic absurdity in referring it to the two animals, any more than the expression ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον, verse 5, is absurd. We also say, loosely, *he sprang from the horses*, though only one of the team, the saddled horse, is meant.

¹ In 1 Thess. i. 7 ἵστε γινέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπον πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, the Singular is used quite regularly, as Paul had in view the church as a *whole*. 1 Cor. x. 6, 11; 1 Pet. v. 3 are passages of a different kind, where the Singular would be surprising.

Quite erroneously has the Plural *ἐπιστολαί* in 1 Cor. xvi. 3 been taken for the Singular (Heumann in loc.). Though this Plural may be thus used of a single letter (Schaeff. Plutarch. V. 446; Poppo, Thuc. 1, 132), yet here the words *δι' ἐπιστολῶν* are certainly to be joined to *πέμψω*; and the sending of several letters to different persons is in itself not at all unlikely.

166 3. Not a few nouns which are used by us ordinarily in the
7th ed. Singular, were employed exclusively, or at least predominantly, in
159 the Plural; this is owing to the objects denoted by them having —
8th ed. from a general or from a Grecian or a Biblical point of view — some sensible or ideal manifoldness or comprehensiveness (Krü. 9f.); as, *αἰῶνες* Heb. i. 2 *world* (עֲוֹלָמוֹת), *οὐρανοί coeli* (Schneider, lat. Gr. II. 476) cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2, *τὰ ἅγια the sanctuary* Heb. viii. 2; ix. 8, 12, etc., *ἀνατολαί, δυσμαί (East, West)* Matt. viii. 11; xxiv. 27 (Plato, def. 411 b.; epin. 990 a.; D. S. 2, 43; Dio. C. 987, 32; Lucian. peregr. 39), *τὰ δεξιά, ἀριστερά, εὐώνυμα, the right, the left* (frequently), *θύραι (fores, folding-door)* Acts v. 19; Jno. xx. 19 (in Greek also *πύλαι*, but *θύραι* is a regular Plural in Acts xvi. 26 f.; Matt. xxiv. 33), *κόλποι bosom* Luke xvi. 23 (22 Sing.) cf. Pausan. 6, 1, 2; Ael. 13, 31; also *τὰ ἱμάτια* of a (single) *upper-garment*, Jno. xix. 23; xiii. 4; Acts xviii. 6; the names of festivals *ἐγκαίνια, γενέσια, ἄζυμα (Παναθήναια, Saturnalia*, Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 20), also *γάμοι marriage* Matt. xxii. 2; Luke xii. 36 (cf. Tob. xi. 20); likewise *ὀψώνια* (Germ. Löhnung, soldier's pay) Rom. vi. 23 (Fr. Rom. I. 428), and *ἀργύρια (pieces of money, Shekel-pieces)* Matt. xxvi. 15; xxviii. 12.

When the names of countries or cities are Plural, this is due to their consisting (originally) of several provinces (as *Galliae*) or settlements; as, *Ἀθῆναι, Πάταρα, Φίλιπποι*, probably also *τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα*.¹

Lastly, nouns denoting a feeling, disposition, or state, express in the Plural the modes or acts in which the feeling, etc. manifests itself; as, 1 Pet. ii. 1 *ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν κακίαν . . . κ. ὑποκρίσεις κ. φθόνους κ. πάσας καταλαλιάς*, 2 Cor. xii. 20 *ἔρις, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι, καταλαλῖαι, ψιθυρισμοί, φυσιώσεις, ἀκαταστασίαι*, 2 Cor. xi. 23 *ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις*, Eph. vi. 190 11; Gal. v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Jas. ii. 1 (2 Cor. ix. 6) Jude 13; 1 Cor. vii. 2; Fr. Rom. III. 6; Kritiz, Sallust. I. 76. So *οἰκτιρμοί, ἐλεῖς* is more common than the Singular (only in Col. iii. 12 var.). Here belongs also Eph. ii. 3 *θελήματα τῆς σαρκός*. See, in general,

¹ Cf. Nölde, schedae Ptolem. I. 22.

Jacobs, Act. philol. Monac. I. 154 sq.; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis p. 75 sq.; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 368; Heinichen, Euseb. III. 18 sq.; Bhdy. 62 f.

The Plural αἵματα Jno. i. 13 of blood as generative matter, has a direct parallel only in Eurip. Ion. 693 in the poetic language; but it is as easily accounted for in reference to a fluid as τὰ ὕδατα and τὰ γάλακτα Plat. legg. 10, 887 d. In Rev. xviii. 24 αἵματα is a real Plural, and accordingly does not come under the above rule;—a remark true also of αἱ γραφαί, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, αἱ διαθήκαι Rom. ix. 4; Eph. ii. 12 (the covenants which God in patriarchal times repeatedly renewed with Abraham, Jacob, through Moses, cf. Wisd. xii. 21; 2 Macc. viii. 15). Similar is ἐπαγγελίας in Heb. vii. 6. A Hebraistic *Plur. majest.* is not to be assumed in these words, nor in Jno. ix. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 1, 7 or Heb. ix. 23, where the statements are general. Τὰ σάββατα when only the weekly day of rest is meant, Matt. 23rd ed. xii. 1; Luke iv. 16, etc., is either a transfer of the Aramaean form סַבְּבַי, or framed after the analogy of names of festivals. More easily might ἅγια ἁγίων, Heb. ix. 3, denoting *the most holy place* of the temple at Jerusalem, be pronounced a *Plur. excell.*, unless, with Erasmus and others, we prefer the accentuation ἁγία ἁγίων (cf. δειλαία δειλαίων Soph. El. 839). However, 160 though this portion of the Israelitish sanctuary is mentioned in the 6th ed. Pentateuch under the designation τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων (Exod. xxvi. 33; Num. iv. 4), cf. Joseph. Antt. 3, 6, 4, yet in 1 Kings viii. 6 *the holy of holies* is actually called τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. Cf. the Latin *penetralia*, *adyta* (Vir. Aen. 2, 297).

In reference to Phil. ii. 6 τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, where ἴσα is used adverbially, compare the classic usage Iliad. 5, 71; Odys. 1, 432; 15, 520; Soph. Oed. R. 1179; Thuc. 3, 14; Philostr. Ap. 8, 26, etc. See Reisig, Oed. Col. 526.

4. The Dual of nouns—except the numeral δύο—does not occur in the N. T., but in its stead only the Plural is used (with δύο in Matt. iv. 18; xviii. 9; xxvi. 37; Jno. iv. 40; Acts xii. 6, etc.); likewise in later Greek, generally, the dual-form is rare. Only in Rev. xii. 14 τρέφεται καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἡμῖν καιροῦ does the Plural of itself denote *two years*; this, however, is an imitation of the Chaldee ܬܪܝܢ Dan. vii. 25 in the Greek versions, and in this connection it may be remarked that the Chaldee regularly has no dual (my Chald. Grammat. S. 77). Accordingly the Plural, placed between *one* year and *half* a year, was allowably made to signify *two*. In later Greek, χρόνος, χρόνοι, came more and more to signify *year*, *years*. See also Evang. apoc. p. 60, 61; Epiphan. Mon. 29, 28.

Bornem. supposes he has found a trace of the Dual in Acts xv. 12 in 191 the reading ἐξηγουμένῳ (ν is added above the line) of *one* Cod. from which

Tdf. notes the reading *ἐξηγούμενοι*, and joyously hails the discovery of this number!

5. The Neuter, sing. or plur., is sometimes employed to denote a person, when the writer purposely expresses himself in general terms; as, 2 Thess. ii. 6 τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε (7 ὁ κατέχων), Heb. vii. 7 τὸ ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται (Theodor. in loc.), [Matt. xviii. 11], Luke i. 35; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28 τὰ μωρὰ τ. κόσμου . . . τὰ ἁσθενή, τὰ ἐξουθενημένα (26 οἱ σοφοί), Jno. vi. 37; 1 Jno. v. 4 cf. 1; (1 Cor. xi. 5, but not Col. i. 20; Heb. vii. 19; Jno. iii. 6; see the more recent expositors. In Rom. xi. 32 the established reading is τοὺς πάντας). Similarly, Thuc. 3, 11 τὰ κράτιστα ἐπὶ τοὺς ὑποδεεστέρους ξυνεπῆγγον, Xen. A. 7, 3, 11 τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα καὶ ἀποδιδράσκοντα ἡμεῖς ἱκανοὶ ἐσόμεθα διώκειν καὶ μαστεύειν, ἣν δέ τις ἀνθίστηται etc., Poppo, Thuc. I. 104; Seidler, Eurip. Troad. p. 61; Kritz, Sall. II. 69.

168 6. The Neuter seems to be employed for the Feminine in Mark
7th ed xii. 28 ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων (for πασῶν, which is a correction). But πάντων has no relation to the gender of the noun, but is equivalent to the general expression *omnium* (rerum); cf. Lucian. piscat. 13 μὴ πάντων ἦγε ἀληθῆς φιλοσοφία (according to the common reading; otherwise πάντως), Thuc. 4, 52 τὰς τε ἄλλας πόλεις καὶ πάντων μάλιστα τὴν Ἀντανδρον, see d'Orville, Charit. p. 549 sq.; Porson, Eur. Phoen. 121; Fr. Mr. I. c.

161 On the other hand, we cannot say with d'Orville (p. 292 sq.)
8th ed that in Acts ix. 37, λούσαντες αὐτὴν ἔθηκαν, the masc. λούσ. is used for λούσασαι because the washing of corpses was the business of women. The writer expresses himself in the most general terms (Hm. Soph. Trachin. p. 39) and without reference to persons: *they washed and laid*. Had Luke intended to refer to that custom with historical precision, he would have employed more definite language. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 7, 2 συνελήλυθασιν . . . ἀδελφαί τε καὶ ἀδελφίδαι καὶ ἀνεψιαί τοσαῦται, ὥστ' εἶναι ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τεσσαρακαίδεκα τοὺς ἐλευθέρους *the free* (free persons) *were fourteen*, where the Masculine is used though by the *free* (as it appears) females are to be understood. Suet. Ner. 33 acceptum a quadam Locusta, venenariorum inclita. (Luke xxii. 58, cf. Matt. xxvi. 71 — the accounts are different; see Mey.)

Neither is the Masculine used for the Feminine in the Sept. in Gen.
192 xxiii. 3 ἀνέστη Ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ αὐτοῦ . . . 4 θάψω τὸν νεκρόν μου (15), though Sarah is meant; nor in the History of Susann. 61 ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ὃν τρόπον ἐπονηρεύσαντο τῷ πλησίον, though the reference is to

Susanna. In the former case we Germans also say: *er begrub seinen Todten* (similarly in Soph. Antig. 830 φθιμένῳ—vulg. φθιμένῳ—τοῖς ἰσοθέοις ἐγκληρα λαχὼν μέγα), and in Greek *corpse* is always ὁ νεκρός, never in the Feminine; see, further, Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 114, 176.

Note 1. In Rom. xi. 4, containing a quotation from the Old Test. (1 Kings xix. 18), we find the Fem. ἡ Βάαλ (Hos. ii. 8; Zeph. i. 4), probably with no secondary contemptuous meaning as the feminine forms of names of false gods are said to be used in Arabic and Rabbinic (?), see Gesen. in Rosenm. Repertor. I. 139 and Tholuck in loc., and, on the other side, Fr. Rom. II. 442; but Paul, quoting from memory, might easily write ἡ Βάαλ as he had occasionally found it in the Sept. (yet at present the Codd. vary), though in this very passage the Sept. has τῇ Βάαλ. Rückert in loc. is in perplexity as often elsewhere. After all, it was matter of indifference whether the male or the female Baal was mentioned. Theile tries to explain by the usage of the Sept. *μοιχαλίδες* in the general address in Jas. iv. 4; but see, on the other hand, de Wette. The omission of the words *μοιχοὶ καὶ* has no decisive external authority in its favor; and it would be carrying deference to the (other) principal Codd. too far, to refuse to admit errors of transcription even when similar words come together.

Note 2. A noun of any gender, taken merely as a *word*, is joined, of course, to the Neuter Art.; as, Gal. iv. 25 τὸ Ἄγαρ, the (word) *Hagar*. 169 On the other hand, the Fem. should seem to be used for the Neut. in ἡ 7th ed. οἰαί Rev. ix. 12; xi. 14; probably, however, some such word as *θλίψις* or *ταλαιπωρία* floated before the mind of the writer.

Note 3. On the adverbial use of a Fem. Adjective, as *ιδίᾳ, κατ' ἰδίαν*, etc., see § 54, 1, p. 463.

§ 28. THE CASES IN GENERAL.

162
6th ed.

1. Foreigners found no difficulty in comprehending in the general the respective import of the Greek cases (Hm. de emend. rat. I. 137 sqq.; Bhdy. S. 74 ff.).¹ And even the Jews were able to express in their language plainly enough the common relations 193 of case, although without the aid of terminations; the mode of denoting the Genitive in particular, approximated in Aramaic to that of the Occidental tongues. It remained, however, a matter of more difficulty to learn to catch the impressions made upon a Greek by the oblique cases in all their manifold and sometimes far-extended applications. Such a use of cases, moreover, did not

¹ A monograph on this subject is, *J. A. Hartung, über die Casus; ihre Bildung und Bedent. in der griech. u. lat. Sprache*. Erlang. 1831, 8vo. (*Rumpel, üb. die Casuslehre in Beziehung auf die griech. Sprache*. Halle 1845, 8vo.)

accord with the graphic and explicit phraseology of Orientals; and we find, accordingly, that in the N. T., agreeably to the Eastern idiom and sometimes in direct imitation of it, prepositions are frequently employed where in classic Greek the simple cases would have sufficed even in prose; for instance, *διδόναι ἐκ, ἐσθίειν ἀπό, μετέχειν ἐκ* for *διδόναι, ἐσθίειν, μετέχειν τινός* (cf. § 30), *πολεμεῖν μετά τινος* for *τινί, κατηγορεῖν* and *ἐγκαλεῖν κατά τινος* (Luke xxiii. 14; Rom. viii. 33) for *τινί,¹ ἐγείρειν τινά εἰς βασιλέα* Acts xiii. 22 (§ 32), *βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ τινι* or *τινά* (ἔξ ἡβῃ) for *τινός, ἀθῶος ἀπό τ.* for the Genitive alone (Krebs, obs. e Josepho p. 73 sq.). [Hither may be referred also without hesitation *μνείσθαι ἐν τ.* Phil. iv. 12 for *τινί*; see Wiesinger in loc.] From the Sept. cf. *φείδεσθαι ἐπὶ τινι* or *τινός* or *ὑπέρ τινος* (ἔξ οὐκ).

This use of prepositions with cases instead of cases alone, is, however, in general characteristic of (antique) simplicity, and occurs therefore in Greek, not only in the earlier poets, as Homer, but in prose writers also, as
 170 Lucian; see Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 11 sq. Hence even from good writers
 7th ed. many instances of the kind may be quoted, such as *παύειν ἀπό*, cf. *Mth.* 833.

2. No case is ever in reality put for another (*enallage casuum*). Sometimes, however, two cases can be used with equal correctness in one and the same connection when the relation to be expressed may be viewed in two different ways; for example *Ἀσσύριος τῷ γένει* and *τὸ γένος, προσκυνεῖν τινι* to show reverence to one, and *προσκυνεῖν τινα* to revere one, *καλῶς ποιεῖν τινα* and *τινα* (Thilo, Act. Thom. 38), *ἐνοχός τινι* and *τινός* (Fr. Mt. p. 223),² *ὁμοίός τινος* and *τινι, πληροῦσθαι τινος* (made full of something) and *τινι* (filled with something). Also *μνησκεισθαι τι* and *τινός* (like *recordari rei* and *rem*); in the former case (with the Acc.)
 163 I conceive of the remembering as directed (transitively) to the
 6th ed. object; with the Gen. (*meminisse rei*) the remembrance is conceived of as emanating or coming from the object. It cannot be said, therefore, that in any instance the Dat. or Acc. is put for the Gen., or *vice versa*; but both cases, logically, are alike correct, and it only remains to notice which construction has become the more usual, or whether one of them belongs especially to the later
 194 language or to any particular writer (as *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τινα, προσκυνεῖν τινι*).

¹ As the Byzantines sometimes say: *ἀγανακτεῖν* or *ὀργίζεσθαι κατὰ τινος*, or Dio Chr. 38, 470 *ὀργίζεσθαι πρὸς τινα*.

² The distinction which Schaefer, Demosth. V. 323, lays down between these two constructions is not confirmed by the N. T. Cf. besides, *Mth.* 850.

Perhaps the most absurd instance of *enallage casuum* that could be alleged, would be 2 Cor. vi. 4 *συνιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι* for *διακόνους*. Both expressions, indeed, can be used, but in different significations. *I commend myself as instructor* (Nom.) means: in the office of an instructor which I have undertaken; but *I commend myself as an instructor* (Acc.) means: as one who wishes or is able to be an instructor.

3. Every case, as such, stands in a necessary connection, according to its nature, with the structure of the sentence in which it occurs. This connection is most direct as regards the Nom. and Acc., the former as the case of the subject, the latter as that of the object; — for secondary relations, the Gen. and Dat. There are also, however, *casus absoluti* i.e. cases which are not wrought into the grammatical structure of the sentence, — cases which are grammatically isolated, and have only a logical connection with the sentence. Nominatives absolute are the most frequent and the most distinctly marked (Bengel on Matt. xii. 36). Real Accusatives absolute are more rare (§ 63. I. 2 d.), cf. Fr. Rom. III. 11 sq., for what is called an Accusative absolute is often dependent, though loosely, on the construction of the sentence. As to Genitives and Datives absolute, the import of these cases proves them to be regular component parts of the sentence. See, in general, A. de Wannowski, *syntaxeos anomalæ graecae pars de constructione, quae dicitur, absoluta*, etc. Lips. 1835, 8vo.; F. W. Hoffmann, *17^a observata et monita de casibus absol. ap. Graecos et Lat. ita posit ut videantur non posse locum habere*. Budiss. 1836, 4to. (it treats only of the Gen. and Dat. absolute); J. Geisler, *de graecor. nominativis absol.* Vratisl. 1845, 8vo., and E. Wentzel, *de genitivis et dat. absol.* Vratisl. 1828, 8vo. But the whole subject of the Nominative absolute comes under the head of Structure of Sentences.

§ 29. NOMINATIVE AND VOCATIVE.

1. A noun considered simply and solely in itself is represented by the Nominative; and is either subject or predicate in a sentence, according to the latter's structure; as, Jno. i. 1 *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος*, Eph. ii. 14 *αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν*.

Sometimes, however, a Nominative, without being wrought into the structure of the sentence to which it belongs, is either placed at its head as a sort of title or topic (Nom. absol.), or inserted as a term of designation (Nom. tituli) as if it were an indeclinable

word: a. Acts vii. 40 ὁ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος . . . οὐκ οἶδαμεν τί γέγονεν αὐτῷ, see § 28, 3. b. Jno. xviii. 10 ἦν ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος, Rev. vi. 8; viii. 11; xix. 13 (Demosth. Macart. 669b.), Luke xix. 29 πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν.¹ Cf. 1 Sam. ix. 9 τὸν προφῆτην ἐκάλεi ὁ λαὸς ἔμπροσθεν ὁ βλέπων; Malal. 18, 482; 10, 247 see Lob. Phryn. 517.² But Acts i. 12 ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος.

Usually, however, names, where an oblique case is necessary, take that case, and so are construed as part of the sentence (and ὀνόματι merely interposed); as, Acts xxvii. 1 ἑκατοντάρχη ὀνόματι Ἰουλίῳ, ix. 11, 12 ἄδρα Ἀνανίαν ὀνόματι εἰσελθόντα (xviii. 2; Matt. xxvii. 32; Luke v. 27), xviii. 7 οἰκία τινὸς ὀνόματι Ἰούστου, also Matt. i. 21, 25 καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, Luke i. 13 (as an apposition to ὄνομα), even Mark iii. 16 ἐτέθηκα ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον. (Different modes of expression are combined in Plut. Coriol. 11.)

172 In Rev. i. 4 the Nom. ὁ ὢν κ. ὁ ἦν κ. ὁ ἐρχόμενος (ἡγῆται, the *Immutable*)^{7th ed.} is designedly used as indeclinable. See § 10. p. 68.

2. Coincident with a. above is the use of the Nom. (with the Article) in addressing, particularly in calling or commanding; consequently, instead of the Vocative, which was intended for this purpose (Fischer-Weller III. 1. 319sq.; Markland, Eurip. Iph. Aul. 446). This use of the Nom. sometimes occurs, also, in the N. T., as Matt. xi. 26 ναὶ, ὁ πατὴρ (ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι 25), ὅτι οὕτως ἐγένετο, Heb. i. 8; x. 7 (in the Sept. cf. Ps. xlii. 2; xxii. 2), especially in the Imperat., as Luke viii. 54 ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε, Matt. xxvii. 29 χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τ. Ἰουδ. Jno. xix. 3; Mark v. 41; ix. 25; Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 18; Rev. vi. 10. This form of expression may have originally possessed some degree of roughness or harshness (Bhdy. 67), and retains it even in Greek prose. Afterwards, however, it was employed without special emphasis, and also in the kindest ad-

¹ In all earlier editions (including that of *Lehm.*) we find ἐλαιῶν. I am not prepared, with *Fr.*, to pronounce this accent positively wrong. Luke, intending his Gospel for foreign readers, in mentioning for the first time the Mount of Olives, well enough known in Palestine, might naturally say, *the so-called Mount of Olives*, as in Acts i. 12. But the expression πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ λεγόμενον ἐλαιῶν would have to be resolved into τὸ λεγόμενον ὄρος ἐλαιῶν *ad montem qui dicitur olivarum*; and the Article before ἐλ. would be by no means necessary. Perhaps even the Syriac translator read Ἐλαιῶν; he renders the

above as he does Acts i. 12: [Δ] [Δω] [Δω] [Δω] but ὄρος τῶν ἐλ. Matt.

xxi. 1, simply [Δ] [Δω] xxiv. 3 etc.

² We find even τὴν ἀνθρωποτόκος φαντήν Theodoret. IV. 1304, τὴν θεὸς προσ-
ηγορίαν III. 241; IV. 454, where the Romans (a circumstance which modern writers of Latin generally overlook) always employ the Genitive.

dresses, as in Luke xii. 32 *μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν πολέμιον*, viii. 54 (Bar. 4, 5), even in prayers, as in Luke xviii. 11; Heb. x. 7.

On the other hand, Jno. xx. 28, though directed to Jesus (*εἶπεν αὐτῷ*), is rather exclamation than address; and, in the Greek authors, such a Nom. has early and strong prominence (Bhdy. as above, Krü. 12). So also Luke xii. 20 (according to the reading *ἄφρων*, and 1 Cor. xv. 36, where *ἄφρων* has little authority in its favor), likewise Phil. iii. 18, 19 *πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν, οὓς πολ- λάκις ἔλεγον . . . τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χρ., ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια . . . οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες*, perhaps also Mark xii. 38–40 *βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, τῶν θελόντων . . . καὶ ἄσπασμους . . . καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας . . . οἱ κατεσθίοντες τὰς οἰκίας . . . οὗτοι λήψονται περισσότερον κρῖμα* (yet here the words *οἱ κατεσθ.* may also be joined with *οὗτοι λήψονται*).¹—Vocative and Nominative are united in Rev. xviii. 20.

3. In the N. T., however, the Vocative, with or more frequently without *ὦ*, is far more common than the Nom. in addresses. We find *ὦ* only in addresses, Acts i. 1; xxvii. 21; xviii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 11, mostly of adjuration and censure (Lob. Soph. Aj. 451 sq., see Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 4), Rom. ii. 1, 3; ix. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 20; Jas. ii. 20; Gal. iii. 1, or in exclamations, as Luke xxiv. 25; Acts xiii. 10. On the other hand, in mere accosting or calling the Vocative without *ὦ* is employed, as Luke xiii. 12; xxii. 57; xxiii. 28; Matt. ix. 22; Jno. iv. 21; xix. 26; Acts xiii. 15; xxvii. 25. Even at the beginning of a speech, where *ὦ* is regularly prefixed by the Greeks, we find in the N. T. for the most part the Vocative alone: Acts i. 16; ii. 14; iii. 12; xiii. 16; xv. 13 (see, however, Franke, Demosth. p. 193).²

An adjective belonging to a Vocative is put in the Voc. also; as, Jas. 173 ii. 20 *ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ*, Matt. xviii. 32; Jno. xvii. 11 (but cf. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 466); on apposition with the Vocative, however, see § 59, 8.

Note. Some have erroneously attributed to the language of the N. T. a Hebraistic circumlocution for the Nominative,

a. by means of the Acc. with *εἰς*, in the phrases *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι εἰς τι* (Leusden, diall. p. 132). By far the greater number of the passages ad- duced are quotations from the Old Test. or expressions taken from it that have become standing phrases (Matt. xix. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. v. 31;

¹ *Hm. praeef. ad Eur. Androm. p. 15 sq.* says, *mihi quidem ubique nominativus, quem pro vocativo positum volunt, non vocantis sed declarantis esse videtur: o tu, qui es talis*. This applies to some of the above passages but not to all, and ought probably to be asserted primarily only of the poets.

² On *ὦ* before the Vocative, see, in general, *Doberenz, Progr. Hildburgh. 1844, 4to.*

Heb. viii. 10, etc.). Besides, it was overlooked that the expression
 197 γίνεσθαι εἰς τι *feri* i.e. *abire* (*mutari*) in *aliquo*. (Acts v. 36; Jno. xvi. 20; Rev. viii. 11) may be used in Greek (Georgi, Vind. 337; Schwarz, Comment. 285), and is used, by the later authors at least, even in reference to persons (Geo. Pachymer. I. 345 εἰς *συνμάχους αὐτοῖς γίνονται*); further, it was not considered that in the Hebrew expression equivalent to εἶναι εἰς τι, the *ἔ* does not properly express the Nom. but corresponds to our (*turn or serve*) *to or for something*, (Heb. viii. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 22, cf. Wisd. ii. 14; Acta apocr. 169). In 1 Cor. iv. 3 ἐμοὶ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν signifies, *to me* (for me) *it belongs to what is of least importance, most insignificant* (I rank it as such). Εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθῆναι Acts xix. 27 is similar: to be accounted as
 166 nothing (Wisd. ix. 6).¹ In Luke ii. 34 κἄται εἰς πᾶσιν the preposition
 174 εἰς indicates in like manner the *destination*, and does not conflict with Greek analogy, see Phil. i. 17 (16); 1 Thess. iii. 3, cf. Aesop. 24, 2 εἰς *μεῖζονά σοι ὠφέλειαν ἐσομαι*, and the Latin *auxilio esse* (Zumpt, Gr. S. 549). See, further, § 32. 4. b. p. 228.

b. by means of ἐν as an imitation of the Hebrew *Beth essentiae* (Gesen. Lgb. 838; Knobel on Isa. xxviii. 16), in the passages Mark v. 25 γυνή τις οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος, Rev. i. 10 ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Glass. I. 31), Eph. v. 9 ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ (Hartmann, linguist. Einl. 384), and Jno. ix. 30 ἐν τούτῳ θαυμαστόν ἐστι (Schleusner, under ἐν). But, in the first passage, εἶναι ἐν β. is *to be in the state of*, etc. In the second, γίνεσθαι ἐν πνεύματι ἐν is *to be present anywhere in spirit*. In the third, εἶναι ἐν is equivalent to *contineri, positum esse in* (see the expositors). The last passage may be aptly rendered: *herein is a marvellous thing*. Gesenius too has attributed this Hebraistic construction to Greek and Latin writers unwarrantably; for εἶναι ἐν σοφοῖς, *in magnis viris* (*habendum*) *esse*, assuredly contains nothing anomalous, but is quite a natural combination, and is to be rendered, *belong to the number of*. *Ἐν* and *in* would be equivalent to a *Beth essentiae* only in case the expression were: ἐν σοφῷ, *in sapienti viro*, for σοφός, *sapiens*. But no reasonable man can talk so, and in a word the Hebraistic *Beth essentiae* construction
 174 is a pure figment of empirical grammarians;² see my edition of Simouis
 174 p. 109, and Fr. Mr. p. 291 sq. The other examples adduced by Haab (S. 337 f.) are so manifestly inadmissible that we will not tarry a moment upon them.

1. The Genitive is acknowledged to be the *whence*-case — (the case denoting source, departure, or descent; cf. Hartung, Casus

¹ Quite different the expression χρήματα εἰς ἀργύριον λογίζεσθαι Xen. C. 3, 1, 33.

² With the entirely misunderstood וְהָיָה עִירָא, Exod. xxxii. 22, compare Ael. 10, 11 ἀποθανεῖν ἐν καλῇ ἔστω. Should this too be taken for καλὸν ἔστω?

S. 12), and is most clearly recognized as such in connection with words expressive of action, and accordingly, with verbs. Its most common and most familiar appearance in prose, however, is in connecting two substantives; here, through its gradually extended signification, it denotes every sort of *dependence* or *belonging*;¹ e.g. ὁ κύριος τοῦ κόσμου, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.

We shall consider first this use of the Genitive — (in connection with which even a Pronoun or the Article cf. § 18, 3 may hold the place of the governing word). And since even this comprehends, 167 in plain prose alone, a great diversity of significations (Schæf. 6th ed. Eurip. Or. 48) exclusive of the common instances, — to which belong particularly the Gen. of quality, Rom. xv. 5, 13 etc., and the partitive Genitive, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 15, — we notice,

a. The Genitive of the Object after substantives which denote an internal or an external operation — a feeling, judgment, action (Krü. 30 f.); as, Matt. xiii. 18 παραβολὴ τοῦ σπειρόντος *parable of* i.e. concerning *the sower*, 1 Cor. i. 6 μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ *testimony concerning Christ* (ii. 1 cf. xv. 15), viii. 7 ἡ συνειδήσις τοῦ εἰδώλου *consciousness about the idol*, i. 18 ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, Matt. xxiv. 6 ἀκοαὶ πολέμων *rumors of wars* (concerning wars), cf. Mtth. 814; Acts iv. 9 εὐεργεσία ἀνθρώπου *towards* (conferred on) *a man* (Thuc. 1, 129; 7, 57; Plat. legg. 8, 850 b.), Jno. vii. 13; xx. 19 φόβος Ἰουδαίων *fear in reference to the Jews* (Eurip. Andr. 1059), xvii. 2 ἐξουσία πάσης σαρκός *power over* (Matt. x. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 12), 2 Pet. ii. 13, 15 μισθὸς ἀδικίας *wages for unrighteousness*, Rom. x. 2 ζήλος θεοῦ *zeal for God* (Jno. ii. 17; 1 Macc. ii. 58; otherwise 2 Cor. xi. 2), Heb. ix. 15 ἀπολύτρωσις τῶν παραβάσεων *redemption from* (Plato, rep. 1. 329 c.). Compare likewise Matt. xiv. 1 (Joseph. antt. 8, 6, 5) Luke vi. 12 (Eurip. Troad. 895) Eph. ii. 20; Rom. xv. 8; 2 Pet. i. 9; Jas. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 15; Heb. x. 24. For examples from Greek authors, see Markland, Eur. suppl. 199 838; d'Orville, Char. p. 498; Schæf. Soph. II. 201; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 201, and Apol. p. 29; Poppo, III. I. 521.

The following phrases are of frequent recurrence in the N. T.: 175 ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ or Χριστοῦ *love to God, to Christ*, Jno. v. 42; 1 Jno. 7th ed. ii. 5, 15; iii. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 5 (but not Rom. v. 5; viii. 35; 2 Cor. v. 14; Eph. iii. 19), φόβος θεοῦ or κυρίου Acts ix. 31; Rom. iii. 18;

¹ If the Genitive is viewed not so much as respects its origin as abstractly, its nature may be defined as follows (Hm. Opusc. I. 175 and Vig. p. 877): Genitivi proprium est id indicare, cuius quid aliquo quocumque modo accidens est. Cf. de emendanda rat. p. 139. Similarly Mdv. 49. See, moreover, Schneider on Caesar, Bell. Gall. 1, 21, 2.

2 Cor. v. 11; vii. 1; Eph. v. 21, *πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ* or *Ἰησοῦ* Mark xi. 22; Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; Phil. iii. 9; Jas. ii. 1; Rev. xiv. 12 (*πίστις ἀληθείας* 2 Thess. ii. 13), *ὑπακοή τοῦ Χριστοῦ* or *τ. πίστεως* etc. 2 Cor. x. 5; Rom. i. 5; xvi. 26; 1 Pet. i. 22 (2 Cor. ix. 13). But *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, in the doctrinal phraseology of Paul (Rom. i. 17; iii. 21 f; x. 3 etc.) is,—agreeably to his teaching concerning *θεὸς ὁ δικαίων* (cf. iii. 30; iv. 5),—righteousness *which God bestows* (on man), and, the meaning once fixed, *δικαιος. θεοῦ* might be predicated even of believers themselves, 2 Cor. v. 21. Others, with Luther, understand the expression thus: the righteousness that avails before God (*quae deo satisfacit*, Fr. Rom. I. 47), *δικ. παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*. The possibility of this explanation lies in *δίκαιος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* Rom. ii. 13 antithetic to *δικαιοῦσθαι*, and still more immediately in *δικαιοῦσθαι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* Gal. iii. 11, or *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ* Rom. iii. 20. Both expressions would be appropriate according to the nature of the *δικαιοῦσθαι* in question. But the interpretation *δικαιοῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον* is the more rigorous, and in Rom. x. 3 a better antithesis is gained if *δικ. θεοῦ* denotes *righteousness which God imparts*. Compare also Phil. iii. 9 *ἢ ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη*.

168 It is obvious from the preceding considerations that the decision between
 the Subjective and the Objective Genitive rests in many passages not with the grammarian but with the exegete, and the latter in making it must give careful attention to parallel passages also.

In Phil. iv. 7 *εἰρήνη θεοῦ* can only mean *the peace* (of soul) *that God gives*, according to the custom of the apostles to wish their readers *εἰρήνην ἀπὸ θεοῦ*; and *this* parallelism is more decisive here than Rom. v. 1 *εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (according to which peace *with* God must be the translation). Likewise in Col. iii. 15 *εἰρήνη Χριστοῦ* I take the Genitive to be Subjective, cf. Jno. xiv. 27. That *δικαιοσύνη πίστεως* (a single notion: *faith-righteousness*), Rom. iv. 13, signifies *righteousness which faith brings with it*, is manifest from the more frequent expression *ἢ δικ. ἢ ἐκ πίστεως* Rom. ix. 30; x. 6. In Eph. iv. 18 *ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ* is *God's-life*; the life of Christian believers is so called as being a life communicated, inwardly excited, by God.

200 Whether the Genitive in the phrase *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is to be taken as Subjective (the Gospel made known by Christ), or Objective (the Gospel concerning Christ), may be doubted. For my part I prefer the latter, because in some passages we find the entire expression *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ* (e.g. Rom. i. 3), of which the other is probably but an abridgment; cf. also *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ* Acts xx. 24, and *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ* Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35. Mey. (on

Mark i. 1) declares himself now for one view, now for the other. Likewise in Col. ii. 18 expositors are not agreed whether in *θρησκεία ἀγγέλων* the 176 Gen. is to be taken as Subjective or as Objective; the latter is preferable: ^{7th ed.} *worship paid to angels, angel-worship*; cf. Euseb. H. E. 6, 41 *θρησκεία τῶν δαιμόνων* (var.), Philo II. 259 *θρ. θεῶν* (ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ λατρεία Plat. Apol. 23 c.). In 1 Tim. iv. 1 *δαμονίων* is undoubtedly a Subjective Genitive. But in *βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς*, Heb. vi. 2, if the latter be considered as the principal noun (see below, 3. note 4), *βαπτισμ.* can only denote the object of the *διδαχή*. In Rom. viii. 23 *ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος*, according to Paul's teaching, appears rather to signify *liberation of the body* (from that *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς* 21) than *liberation from the body*. Likewise in Heb. i. 3; 2 Pet. i. 9 *καθαρισμὸς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν* might mean *purification of sins* (removal of sins, cf. Deut. xix. 13), just as one may say *καθαρίζονται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι* (cf. *καθαίρειν αἷμα* to remove by purification, Iliad 16, 667); but it is simpler to take *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν* as an Objective Genitive. In Rom. ii. 7 *ὑπομονὴ ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ*, 1 Thess. i. 3 *ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος*, is simply: *steadfastness of well-doing, steadfastness of hope*. Jas. ii. 4 is probably an indignant question: *would ye not in this become judges of evil thoughts* (your own)?

2. But the Genitive is likewise employed, b. to denote relations of dependence still more remote (cf. Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 108 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Tim. p. 241 sq.; Bhdy. 160 ff.). In this way, by a kind of condensed expression, compound designations are formed which must be resolved variously, according to the relation of the ideas composing them. We distinguish,

a. The Genitive which expresses relations entirely *external* (of 169 place or of time); as, Matt. x. 5 *ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν* *the way to the gentiles* ^{8th ed.} (Heb. ix. 8 cf. Gen. iii. 24. *ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς*, Jer. ii. 18; Judith v. 14)¹, Jno. x. 7 *θύρα τῶν προβάτων* *door to the sheep* (Mey.), Matt. i. 11, 12 *μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶνος* *the carrying away to Babylon* (Orph. 200 *ἐπὶ πλόον Ἀξείνοιο* *ad expeditionem in Axinum*, 144 *νόστος οἰκοιο* *domum reditus*, Eurip. Iph. T. 1066 cf. Schaef. Melet. p. 90; Seidler, Eurip. Electr. 161; Spohn, Isocr. Paneg. p. 2; Bttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 67),² Jno. vii. 35 *ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων* *the dispersion* (the dispersed) *among the Greeks*, Mark viii. 27 *κῶμαι Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου* *towns about Caesarea Ph.*, situated on its territory (Isa. xvii. 2),³ Col. i. 20 *αἷμα τοῦ σταυροῦ* *blood of the* 201

¹ But Matt. iv. 15 *ὁδὸς θαλάσσης* undoubtedly *way by the sea* (of Tiberias).

² *Vice versa* Plat. Apol. 40 c. *μετοίκησις τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἐνθ' ἐνδ' ε* (away from this place).

³ This finally comes back to the common topographical (*Krū.* 27) Genitive, as Jno. ii. 1 *Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, Acts xxii. 3 *Ταπόδς τῆς Κιλικίας*, xiii. 13 f.; xxvii. 5; Luke iv. 26; cf. Xen. H. 1, 2, 12; D. S. 16, 92; 17, 63; Diog. L. 8, 3; Arrian. Al. 2, 4, 1, see *Ellendt*, Arrian. Al. I. 151; *Ramshorn*, lat. Gr. I. 167 — and this is simply the Genitive of belonging.

cross i.e. *blood shed on the cross*, 1 Pet. i. 2 ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος *sprinkling* (purifying) *with blood*, 2 Cor. xi. 26 κίνδυνοι ποταμῶν *dangers on rivers* (followed immediately by κίνδ. ἐν πόλει, ἐν θαλάσσῃ etc.), cf. Heliod. 2, 4, 65 κίνδυνοι θαλασσῶν.

Designations of time: Rom. ii. 5 (Zeph. ii. 2) ἡμέρα ὀργῆς *day of wrath*, that is, day on which the punitive wrath of God will be manifested, Jude 6 κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας *judgment (at) on the great day*, Luke ii. 44 ὁδὸς ἡμέρας *a day's journey* (distance travelled in a day, cf. Her. 4, 101; Ptol. 1, 11, 4), Heb. vi. 1 ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος *primary Christian instruction*. So also τεκμήρια ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα Acts i. 3 according to D.¹

An external (local) relation also is expressed in ἀλάβαστρον μύρου Mark xiv. 3 and κεράμιον ὕδατος verse 13, cf. 1 Sam. x. 3 ἀγγεῖα ἄρων, ἀσκὸς οἴνου, Soph. El. 758 χαλκὸς σποδοῦ (see Schaeff. Longi Pastor. p. 386), Dion. H. IV. 2028 ἀσφάλτου καὶ πίσης ἀγγεῖα, Theoph. Ch. 17; Diog. L. 6, 9; 7, 3; Lucian. asin. 37; fugit. 31; Diod. S. Vatic. 32, 1. Under this head also comes Jno. xxi. 8 τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων (11 μεστόν ἰχθύων), even ἀγέλη χοίρων Matt. viii. 30 and ἑκατὸν βάτοι ἐλαίου Luke xvi. 6. See on this Genitive of contents, Krü. 32.

Ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν is nowhere in the N. T. equivalent to ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν, but denotes even in Rom. i. 4 *the resurrection of the dead*, absolutely and generically, although consummated only in a single individual. The doctrinal remarks of Philippi on this expression are mere trifling.

β. The more remote *internal* relations are especially expressed by the Genitive in the writings of John and Paul; as, Jno. v. 29 ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, κρίσεως, *resurrection to life, resurrection to judgment* (Genitive of destination, Theodor. IV. 1140 ἱερωσύνης χειροτονία *to the priesthood*, cf. Rom. viii. 36 Sept. πρόβατα σφαγῆς), Rom. v. 18 δικαίωσις ζωῆς *justification to life*, Mark i. 4 βάπτισμα μετανόιας *baptism engaging to repentance*, Rom. vii. 2 νόμος τοῦ ἀνδρός *law of the husband*, i.e. which lays down the relation to the husband (cf. Dem. Mid. 390 a. ὁ τῆς βλάβης νόμος *the law of damage*, frequently in the Sept. as in Lev. xiv. 2 ὁ νόμος τοῦ λεπροῦ, vii. 1; 202 xv. 32; Num. vi. 13, 21, see Fr. Rom. II. 9), vi. 6 σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας *body of sin*, i.e. body which belongs to sin, in which sin has tenancy and lordship (in which sin is carried into effect), very like σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς Col. i. 22 body in which carnality permanently dwells;

¹ Others, with less probability, take ἡμερῶν τεσσαρ. by itself: *during forty days* (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 640 sq.); yet see below, No. 11, p. 207.

Rom. vii. 24 σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου τούτου *body of this death*, i.e. which (in the way described vs. 7 sqq.) leads to death, vss. 5, 10, and 13. See, further, Tit. iii. 5.

In Luke xi. 29 τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ is simply *the sign once exhibited in Jonah* (now to be repeated in the person of Christ). In the same way must Jude 11 be explained; but in Jno. xix. 14 παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα does not mean the day of preparation for the Passover, but simply and naturally 178 the resting-day of the Passover (the day of rest belonging to the Paschal festival). In Heb. iii. 13 ἀπάτη τῆς ἀμαρτίας is the Subjective Genitive, and ἀμαρτία is to be taken as a personification (Rom. vii. 11 etc.). Yet in 2 Thess. ii. 10 ἀπάτη τῆς ἀδικίας is, *deceit leading to unrighteousness*. On Eph. iv. 18 see Mey., and on Jas. i. 17 de Wette. Further, in Eph. iii. 1; 2 Tim. i. 8, Philem. 1, 9 δέσμος Χριστοῦ *a prisoner of Christ* means one whom Christ (the cause of Christ) has made and keeps a prisoner,¹ cf. Wisd. xvii. 2; in Jas. ii. 5 οἱ πτωχοὶ τοῦ κόσμου (if the reading is correct) *the poor of the world* signifies, they who in their position in the world are poor, poor therefore in worldly goods (though κόσμος itself does not on this account mean worldly goods). In Jno. vi. 45 διδακτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ *instructed of God*, that is by God, as in Matt. xxv. 34 οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς means *blessed by the Father*. In Eph. vi. 4, 11, 13 κυρίου and θεοῦ are genitivi auctoris, as also τῶν γραφῶν Rom. xv. 4. Likewise Phil. i. 8 ἐν σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ Ἰ. is to be taken as the Subjective Genitive, though the more precise interpretation may be various. Cf. also Eph. vi. 4 and 171 Mey. Lastly, the correct interpretation of 1 Pet. iii. 21 does not depend 6th ed. so much on the Genitive συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς as on the meaning of ἐπερώτημα; *sponsio* would accord perfectly with the context, but this rendering has not been lexically established either by de Wette or Huther. On Heb. ix. 11 see Bleek. In 1 Cor. i. 27 τοῦ κόσμου is the Subjective Genitive; see Meyer. In 1 Cor. x. 16 τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας means simply *the cup of blessing*, that is, over which the blessing is uttered; and in 21 ποτ. κυρίου 203 means *cup of the Lord*, where the closer relation of the Genitive is to be gathered from 16, just as in Col. ii. 11 that of Χριστοῦ is to be deduced from 14. Mey. gives a correct decision on Col. i. 14. In Acts xxii. 3 νόμον depends on κ. ἀκρίβειαν.

¹ As in Philem. 13 δεσμοὶ τοῦ εὐαγγ. means bonds which the Gospel has brought. Without reference to the parallel passages the above might be rendered: *a prisoner belonging to Christ*. Others translate it, *a prisoner for Christ's sake*. In the N. T. the Genitive is frequently so explained (Mtth. 851; Krü. 31), yet always incorrectly. Heb. xiii. 13 τὸν διουδισμὸν Χριστοῦ φέροντες is: *bearing the reproach which Christ bore* (and still bears). So also 2 Cor. i. 5 περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς *the sufferings which Christ had to endure*, i.e. from the enemies of divine truth, come (anew) abundantly upon us; for, the sufferings which believers endure (for the sake of divine truth) are essentially one with the sufferings of Christ, — only a continuation of them (cf. Phil. iii. 10). So also probably Col. i. 24 αἱ θλίψεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ and 2 Cor. iv. 10. On the first passage, which has been very variously explained, see Lücke, Progr. in loc. Col. i. 24 (Götting. 1833, 4to.) p. 12 sq., and Huther and Mey. in loc.

Some refer the Genitive οἶκον in Heb. iii. 3 to τιμὴν, *greater honor of the house* (i.e. in, from, the house), etc. This construction, though not of itself inadmissible, is, for this writer, stiff, and clearly opposed to his design; see Bleek.

On the Genitive of apposition in particular, as πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας 2 Pet. ii. 6 (urbs *Romae*), σημείον περιτομῆς Rom. iv. 11, see § 59, 8, p. 531.

3. It was long usual to regard the Genitive of Relationship as a Genitive with an ellipsis; as, Μαρία Ἰακώβου, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, 179 Δαυὶδ ὁ τοῦ Ἰεσσαί. But as the Genitive is the case of dependence, 18th ed. and as every relationship is a sort of dependence, there is no essential notion wanting in such expressions (Hm. Ellips. p. 120); only the thought which the Gen. expresses in a very general way (Plato, rep. 3, 408 b.) is left to be defined by the reader according to the facts in the case. Most frequently this Gen. implies son or daughter; as, Matt. iv. 21; Jno. vi. 71; xxi. 2, 15; Acts xiii. 22. But μήτηρ is to be understood in Luke xxiv. 10; Mark xv. 47; xvi. 1, cf. Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40 (Aelian. 16, 30 Ὀλυμπιάς ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρου sc. μήτηρ), πατήρ in Acts vii. 16 Ἐμμὼρ τοῦ Συχέμ (cf. Gen. xxxiii. 19; similar in Steph. Byzant. under Δαίδαλα: ἡ πόλις ἀπὸ Δαϊδάλου τοῦ Ἰκάρου), γυνή in Matt. i. 6 ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου and Jno. xix. 25 (see my RWB. II. 57 f.) cf. Aristoph. eccl. 46; Plin. epp. 2, 20 Verania Pisonis; ἀδελφός perhaps, in Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13 Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, if the same apostle is mentioned in Jude 1 (cf. Alcephr. 2, 2 Τιμοκράτης ὁ Μητροδώρου sc. ἀδελφός). Such designation in the circle of the Apostles might have arisen from the circumstance that James, the brother of Judas, was better known or more prominent than the father of Judas. See, in general, Bos, ellips. ed. Schaef. under the words; Boisson. Philostr. her. p. 307.

In 1 Cor. i. 11 οἱ Χλόης are, accordingly, *Chloe's people*, as in Rom. xvi. 10, 11 οἱ Ἀριστοβούλου, οἱ Ναρκίσσου. A more definite explanation must be supplied by the facts of the case. Perhaps we should here understand, with most expositors, *the members of the household* of these persons. Others understand *the slaves*. To the original readers the expression was clear. Further, see Valcken. in loc.

204 Note 1. It is not unusual, especially in Paul's style, to find *three* Genitives connected together, and grammatically governed one by another.

172 Frequently, however, one of them is employed instead of an adjective:

18th ed. 2 Cor. iv. 4 τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Eph. i. 6 εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, iv. 13 εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (where the last two Genitives go together), i. 19; Rom. ii. 4; Col. i. 20; ii. 12, 18; 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 9; Rev. xviii. 3; xxi. 6; Heb. v. 12; 2 Pet. iii. 2, cf. Krüger, Xen. A. 2, 5, 38; Bornem. Xenoph. Apol.

p. 44; Boisson. Babr. p. 116. In Rev. xiv. 10 (xix. 15) οἶνος τοῦ θυμοῦ must be taken together: *wine of wrath*, burning wine, according to an O.T. figure. Four Genitives occur in Rev. xiv. 8 ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, xvi. 19; xix. 15 (Judith ix. 8; x. 3; xiii. 18; Wisd. xiii. 5, etc.). On the other hand, in 2 Cor. iii. 6 διακόνους καυῆς διαθήκης οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος the last two Genitives must, on account of verse 7, be considered as both dependent on the principal noun. In Rom. xi. 33 all the three Genitives, in the same way, refer to βάθος.

Note 2. Sometimes, particularly in Paul's epistles, the Genitive (when placed after) is separated from its governing noun by another word; as, Phil. ii. 10 ἵνα πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων (Genitives subjoined in explanation of πᾶν γόνυ), Rom. ix. 21 ἣ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ; 1 Tim. iii. 6 ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου (probably for emphasis), 1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 7; Heb. viii. 5; Jno. xii. 11; 1 Pet. iii. 21. Otherwise still in Rev. vii. 17. On the other hand, in Eph. ii. 3 ἡμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, a different position of the words was hardly possible, if an unsuitable stress (ἡμεν φύσει τέκ. ὀργ.) was not to fall on φύσει. See, in general, Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 46; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 241; Fr. Rom. II. 331.

Note 3. Rarely two Genitives of *different* relations (particularly the one of a person, the other of a thing), mostly also separated from each other by position, are joined to a *single* noun (Krü. 33), e.g. Acts v. 32 ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν αὐτοῦ (Χριστοῦ) μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων, 2 Cor. v. 1 ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους, Phil. ii. 30 τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς λειτουργίας, 2 Pet. iii. 2 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου. [Matt. xxvi. 28 τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης,] Heb. xiii. 7, cf. Her. 6, 2 τὴν Ἰώνων τὴν ἡγεμονίην τοῦ πρὸς Δαρεῖν πολέμου, Thuc. 3, 12 τὴν ἐκείνων μέλλειν τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς δεινῶν, 6, 18 ἡ Νικίου τῶν λόγων ἀπραγμοσύνη, Plat. legg. 3, 690 b. τὴν τοῦ νόμου ἐκόντων ἀρχήν, rep. 1, 329 b. τὰς τῶν οἰκείων προπηλακίσεις τοῦ γήρως, Diog. L. 3, 37 and very strained Plat. Apol. 40 c. μετοίκησις τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἐνθένδε, see Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 329; ad legg. p. 84 sq.; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 219; Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 17, and Soph. Philoctet. v. 751; Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 111 sq.; Bhdy. 162; Mtth. 864 (Kritz, Sallust. II. 170).

To this head we may also refer 1 Pet. iii. 21 σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου *the flesh's putting away of filth* (σὰρξ ἀποτίθεται ῥύπον), unless there be here a transposition.

In a different way two Genitives are connected together in Jno. vi. 1 ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος *the Sea of Galilee, of Tiberias*. 205 Under the last name alone it occurs the second time in Jno. xxi. 1. Perhaps for the sake of foreign readers John annexed the more definite to the more general designation (cf. Fausan. 5, 7, 3) that they might determine the locality more certainly. Beza in loc. takes a different view. Kühnöl's suspicion, that the words τῆς Τιβ. are a gloss, is hasty. The explanation 173 of Paulus, however, — *setting sail from Tiberias* — if not at variance with

classic prose, is opposed to the style of the N. T. (cf. Bornem. Acta p. 149), which, in such circumstances, prefers to the simple case the more vivid mode of expression by means of the preposition. Τῷβ. cannot be made to depend on the ἀπό in ἀπῆλθεν.

Note 4. The Genitive, when placed *before* the governing noun, either a belongs to two nouns at the same time, as in Acts iii. 7 αὐτοῦ αἱ βάσεις καὶ τὰ σφυρά, Jno. xi. 48, or b. is emphatic (Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 118; Mdv. 13), as e.g. in 1 Cor. iii. 9 θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί, θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε, Acts xiii. 23 τούτου (Δαυὶδ) ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος ... 181 ἦγαγε σωτήρα Ἰησοῦν, Jas. i. 26 εἰ τις ... τούτου μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία, iii. 3; 1st ed. Heb. x. 36; Eph. ii. 8. The emphasis is not unfrequently founded in an expressed antithesis: Phil. ii. 25 τὸν συστρατιώτην μου, ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου, Matt. i. 18; Heb. vii. 12, 1 Pet. iii. 21; Eph. ii. 10; vi. 9; Gal. iii. 15; iv. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 15; Rom. iii. 29; xiii. 4. The Genitive, however, for the most part contains the principal notion: Rom. xi. 13 ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος *apostle of the Gentiles*, 1 Tim. vi. 17 ἐπὶ πλούτου δδηλότηρι *upon riches which are perishable*, Tit. i. 7; Heb. vi. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 14. That the placing of the Genitive before the governing noun belongs to the peculiarities of diction of a particular author (Gersdorf 296 ff.), though not in itself impossible (since emphatic combinations are weakened by individual writers), at least cannot be shown to be probable. Cf. moreover, Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 243. Heb. vi. 2 is a difficult passage; βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς (depending on θεμέλιον) certainly belong together, and διδαχῆς cannot be torn away so strangely and regarded as the governing noun to all four Genitives, as Ebrard still maintains. But the question is, whether we should here admit a transposition for διδαχῆς βαπτισμῶν, as most later expositors do. Such a transposition, however, would be at variance with the whole structure of the verse; and if βαπτισμοὶ διδαχῆς is translated *doctrinal baptisms*, baptisms in connection with instruction, to distinguish them from the legal baptisms (lustrations) of Judaism, this appellation is confirmed as distinctively Christian by Matt. xxviii. 19 βαπτίζαντες αὐτοὺς ... διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς. Ebrard's objection, that Christian baptism is distinguished from mere lustrations, not by instruction, but by the forgiveness of sins and regeneration, amounts to nothing, for Matt. xxviii. says nothing about the forgiveness of sins. As regards the use of the word βαπτισμός, and in the Plural too, what Tholuck has already remarked may be used also in support of the above explanation.

206 Note 5. Kühnöl and others consider περί with the Acc. in Mark iv. 19 αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμία as a circumlocution for the Genitive. But, though Mark might have written αἱ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπιθ., yet the former expression is not only more definite, but περί obviously retains its force: cupiditates, quae circa reliqua (rel. res) versantur (Heliød. 1, 23, 45 ἐπιθυμία περὶ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν, Aristot. rhet. 2. 12 αἱ περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐπιθυμία), just as (with the Gen.) in Jno. xv. 22. It is another thing when, in

Greek authors, *περί* with the Acc. is used as a circumlocution for the 174
Genitive of an object to which a certain quality is ascribed, e.g. Diod. S. 6th ed.
11, 89 ἡ *περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀρχαίτης*, and again τὸ *περὶ τοὺς κρατήρας ἰδίωμα* (cf.
Schaeff. Julian. p. VI. and Dion. comp. p. 23). With more reason might
it be said that in 1 Cor. vii. 37 *ἐξουσία περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου θελήματος* this prepo-
sition is used with the Gen. as a circumlocution for the Genitive, because
the Genitive alone might also have been employed; but *power over* (with
respect to) *his own will*, is at all events the more definite and full expression.
Expositors find a similar circumlocution for the Gen. by means of *ἀπό* and
ἐκ in Acts xxiii. 21 *τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν*, 2 Cor. viii. 7 *τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀγάπῃ*.
This, however, is literally *amor qui a vobis proficiscitur*, *promissio a te* 182
profecta, and is more precise than *τῇ ὑμῶν ἀγάπῃ*, which might also mean 7th ed.
amor in vos.¹ So Thuc. 2, 92 ἡ *ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων βοήθεια*, Dion. H. IV.
2235 *πολὺν ἐκ τῶν παρόντων κινήσας ἄλυν*, Plato, rep. 2, 363 a. *τὰς ἀπ' αὐτῆς*
εἰδοκιμήσεις, Demosth. pac. 24 b.; Polyæn. 5, 11; D. S. 1, 8; 5, 39; Exc.
Vat. p. 117; Lucian. conscr. hist. 40; cf. Jacobs, Athen. 321 sq. and Anthol.
pal. I. 1, 159; Schaeff. Soph. Aj. p. 228; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 329. Also
Rom. xi. 27 ἡ *παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη* must be explained in the same way. Cf.
Xen. C. 5, 5, 13; Isocr. Demon. p. 18; Arrian. Al. 5, 18, 10 (Fr. in loc.
and Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 193). On Jno. i. 14 see Lücke. None of these
passages contains an unmeaning circumlocution. And in 1 Cor. ii. 12 *ὁ*
τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ, the apostle
has of set purpose employed in the parallel *τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ* (not *τὸ πν. θεοῦ* or *τὸ*
θεοῦ). No tolerably attentive reader will admit the alleged circumlocution
for the Gen. by means of *ἐν* (see Koppe, Eph. p. 60), in proof of which
1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. ii. 21; Tit. iii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 7 are adduced. Nor does
κατὰ constitute a mere circumlocution for the Genitive in the examples
usually quoted. In Rom. ix. 11 ἡ *κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις* means the purpose
according to, in consequence of, election. In Rom. xi. 21 *οἱ κατὰ φύσιν*
κλάδοι are the branches according to nature i.e. the natural branches. So
Heb. xi. 7 ἡ *κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη*. In Heb. ix. 19, too, *κατὰ τὸν νόμον*,
if referred to *πάσης ἐντολῆς*, would not be put for *τοῦ νόμου*, as Bleek per-
ceived. Yet, see above, § 22, 7. More pertinent examples are found in
Greek writers; as, Diod. S. 1, 65 ἡ *κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπόθεσις* the *abdication*
of the government (literally, as regards the government), 4, 13; Exc. Vat.
p. 103; Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 12; Mith. 866. On *εὐαγγ. κατὰ Ματθ.* etc. see 207
Fr. (cf. instances in the nova biblioth. Lubec. II. 105 sq.). It is quite
erroneous to take τὰ *εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα* 1 Pet. i. 11 for τὰ *Χριστοῦ*
παθήματα (v. 1). It means (similar to *περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος* vs. 10)
the sufferings (destined) for Christ.

It is a different matter, when a Genitive dependent on a noun is ren-
dered by means of a preposition because the (corresponding) *verb* prefers
this construction; as, *κοινωνία ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* Phil. i. 5 cf. iv. 15.

¹ 2 Cor. ix. 2 ὁ *ἐξ ὑμῶν ζήλος ἤρθε* is referable to attraction.

So probably also ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν (*after God*) 1 Pet. iii. 21, cf. 2 Sam. xi. 7 ἐπερωτῶν εἰς θεόν.

- 175 4. The same sort of direct dependence occurs in the connection
 6th ed. of the Genitive with verbal adjectives and participles whose signi-
 fication is not such that they (the verbs from which they come)
 could regularly govern the Genitive (2 Pet. ii. 14 μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος,
 Matt. x. 10 ἄξιος τῆς τροφῆς, Heb. iii. 1 κλήσεως μέτοχοι etc. see
 No. 8; Eph. ii. 12 ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν etc.); as, 1 Cor. ii. 13 λόγοι
 διδακτοὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, see above, p. 189, 2 Pet. ii. 14 καρδίαν
 γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας cf. Iliad. 5, 6 λελουμένος ὠκεάνιοιο, Soph.
 183 Aj. 807 φωτὸς ἡπατῆμένη, 1353 φίλων νικώμενος, and with 1 Cor.
 7th ed. especially Soph. El. 344 κείνης διδακτά, with 2 Pet. Philostr. her.
 2, 15 θαλάττης οὐπω γεγυμνασμένοι, 3, 1 Νέστορα πολέμων πολλῶν
 γεγυμνασμένον, 10, 1 σοφίας ἤδη γεγυμνασμένον, see Boisson. Philostr.
 her. p. 451. We resolve all these Genitives by a preposition:
 taught of (by) the Holy Spirit, bathed in the ocean, inured to the
 sea, etc. And perhaps in the simple language of antiquity the
 Genitive in such constructions was regarded as the *whence* case;
 see Hartung, S. 17. According to this view the two following
 passages also are easily explained: Heb. iii. 12 καρδίᾳ πονηρᾷ ἀπι-
 στίας *a heart evil* (with respect to) *unbelief* (where ἀπιστία is that
 which establishes the *πονηρία*; substantively *πονηρία ἀπιστίας* the
 Genitive (of apposition) would seem quite natural; similarly Wisd.
 xviii. 3 ἡλὼν ἀβλαβῇ φιλοτίμου ξενιτείας παρέσχες, see Monk, Eurip.
 Alcest. 751; Mtth. 811, 818. Secondly, Jas. i. 13 ἀπειράστος κακῶν,
 which most expositors render: *untempted* (that cannot be tempted)
by evil (cf. Soph. Antig. 847 ἄκλαντος φίλων, Aeschyl. Theb. 875
 κακῶν ἀτρυμονες Schwenck, Aeschyl. Eumen. 96); Schulthess,
 however, translates it: *inexperienced in evil*. The parallelism
 with πειράζει does not favor the last interpretation. The active
 acceptance in the Aethiopic version, *not tempting to evil*, is to be
 rejected more on the ground that the πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα fol-
 lowing would be tautological (for the apostle, as the δέ shows,
 208 must intend to say something different from ἀπειρ.), and also that
 ἀπειρ. does not occur in the active sense, than, as Schulth. thinks,
 on account of the Genitive κακῶν.¹ The Genitive has great latitude
 of import, at least in the poets and in such writers as approach a
 poetic or rhetorical diction. Ἀπειρ. κακῶν might denote *not temp-
 ting in respect to evil*, just as well as in Soph. Aj. 1405 λουτρῶν

¹ On the active and passive acceptance of verbals see Wex, Soph. Antig. I. 162.

ὁσίων ἐπίκαιρος *suitable for holy washings*, or in Her. 1, 196 παρθένοι γάμων ὥραϊαι *ripe for marriage*.

Paul's expression κληροὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Rom. i. 6 should not be brought under this rule, as is still done by Thiersch. It means, according to the apostle's view of κλησίς elsewhere, *Christ's called*, i.e. *called* (by God) who are *Christ's*, belong to Christ. On the other hand, we may refer to this head ὁμοίως τινος Jno. viii. 55 (this adj. regularly governs the Dat. [which case, indeed, even in the passage just mentioned Lchm. placed in the text, but against the balance of authorities and against Cod. Sin. also]) Mtth. 873; 176 Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 104; III. 46 (on similis *alicuius* and the like, ^{6th ed.} see Zumpt, lat. Gr. S. 365 f.), and ἐγγύς with the Gen. Jno. xi. 18; Rom. x. 8; xiii. 11; Heb. vi. 8; viii. 13, etc., the usual construction here, along with which, however, ἐγγύς τινι occurs; see Bleek, Hebr. II. II. 209; Mtth. 812. Even adjectives compounded with σύν are sometimes followed by ¹⁸⁴ the Genitive; as, σύμμορφος τῆς εἰκόνος Rom. viii. 29 (Mtth. 864). ^{7th ed.}

5. Most closely related to the simple Genitive of dependence after substantives and in reality only an expansion of that Genitive into a clause, is the very common εἶναι or γίνεσθαι τινος. This construction has a still more diversified use in Greek prose (Krü. 28 f.; Mdv. 57 f.; Ast, Lexic. Platon. I. 621), than in the N. T.; and was formerly explained by assuming that a preposition or a substantive was understood.

In the N. T. may be distinguished,

a. The Genitive of the whole, of the class (Plur.) and of the sphere (Sing.) to which one belongs, 1 Tim. i. 20 ὃν ἐστὶν Ἰμεναῖος *of whom is* (to whom belongs) *Hym.*, 2 Tim. i. 15; Acts xxiii. 6 (1 Macc. ii. 18; Plato, Protag. 342 e.; Xen. A. 1, 2, 3), 1 Thess. v. 5, 8 οὐκ ἐσμεν νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότους . . . ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας *δυντες belonging to the night, to the day*, Acts ix. 2.

b. The Genitive of the ruler, master, possessor, etc., Matt. xxii. 28 τίνος τῶν ἐπὶ ἐστὶ γυνή; 1 Cor. iii. 21 πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστιν (Xen. A. 2, 1, 4; Ptol. 1, 8, 1), vi. 19 οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐαυτῶν *ye are not your own — do not belong to yourselves*, 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾗ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν *that . . . may be God's and not of us*, x. 7 Χριστοῦ εἶναι, Rom. viii. 9 (similarly 1 Cor. i. 12 of heads of parties ἐγὼ εἰμι Παύλου, cf. Diog. L. 6, 82). Close to 209 this comes Acts i. 7 οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γινῶναι etc. *it does not belong to you — it is not in your power to know* (Plato, Gorg. 500 a.; Xen. Oec. 1, 2), Mark xii. 7 ἡμῶν ἐστὶ ἡ κληρονομία (Matt. v. 3), 1 Pet. iii. 3, further Heb. v. 14 τελείων ἐστὶν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή *belongs to (is for) mature persons*, etc.

c. The Genitive of a quality in which one participates (sing. abstract), in diversified applications, 1 Cor. xiv. 33 οὐκ ἔστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεός, Heb. x. 39 ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς . . . ἀλλὰ πίστεως etc. (Plato, apol. 28 a.). Likewise the concrete Gen. Acts ix. 2 τινὰς τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, particularly the Genitive of age, Mark v. 42 ἡν ἐτῶν δώδεκα, Luke ii. 42; iii. 23; Acts iv. 22; Tob. xiv. 2, 11; Plato, legg. 4, 721 a. In these passages the subject is a person, but in the following it is a thing: Heb. xii. 11 πᾶσα παιδεία οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι *is not (matter) of joy* (this, however, might be referred also to a.), 2 Pet. i. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται. Moreover, this construction of εἶμι, when persons are the subject, is sometimes made more animated, in Oriental style, by the insertion of υἱός or τέκνον; cf. 1 Thess. v. 5 ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας.¹

The same relations are expressed by the Genitive when the verb εἶναι is omitted, Phil. iii. 5 ἐγὼ . . . φυλῆς Βενιαμίν.

6. The Genitive, as the clearly defined case of *departure, motion* 185 *whence*, appears, too, in the diction of the N. T., joined to verbs 7th ed. (and adjectives), with a diversity of application natural to this rela- 177 tion. (This diversity, however, is more copious in Greek prose, and 6th ed. in the N. T. the Gen. is frequently strengthened by prepositions.) As *separation* from is related to proceeding from, and as that which departs and is separated may often be conceived as a *part* of the remaining whole, the Genitive, because the case of proceeding from, is also naturally the case of *separation* and of *partition*. The former, the Genitive of *separation* and *removal*, as the more limited, we shall illustrate first.

As words which express the idea of separation or removal are usually construed with the Genitive by the Greeks even in prose,—e.g. ἐλευθεροῦν τινος to free *from* something, κωλύειν, ὑποχωρεῖν, παύειν, διαφέρειν, ὑστερεῖν τινος, see Mtth. 829 ff., 845; Bhdy. 179 f. (although in such circumstances suitable prepositions are pretty frequently inserted),—so in the N. T. also the following verbs are construed with the Genitive: μετασταθῆναι Luke xvi. 4, ἀστοχεῖν 1 Tim. i. 6, παύεσθαι 1 Pet. iv. 1, κωλύειν Acts xxvii. 43 (cf. Xen. C. 2, 4, 23; Anab. 1, 6, 2; Pol. 2, 52, 8 a.), διαφέρειν Matt. x. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 41 etc. (Xen. C. 8, 2, 21, cf. Krü. Dion. H. p. 462), ἀπο- 210 στερεῖσθαι 1 Tim. vi. 5,² also ὑστερεῖν to be *behind one* 2 Cor. xi. 5;

¹ We Germans also say both *du bist des Todes* and *du bist ein Kind des Todes*. But this does not prove that the former expression is elliptical (Kuinoel ad Heb. x. 39).

² Lachm., on the authority of good Codd., has adopted in Acts xix. 27 . . . μέλλων τε

xii. 11, see Bleek on Heb. iv. 1 and ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν Eph. ii. 12.

The interposition of prepositions, however, predominates :

a. With verbs of *disjoining*, *freeing*, and *being free*, invariably (Mtth. 665 ; Bhdy. 181) ; as, χωρίζω ἀπό Rom. viii. 35 ; 1 Cor. vii. 10 ; Heb. vii. 26 (Plat. Phaed. 67 c., but Polyb. 5, 111, 2) ; λύω ἀπό Luke xiii. 16 ; 1 Cor. vii. 27 ; ἐλευθεροῦν ἀπό Rom. vi. 18, 22 ; viii. 2, 21 (Thuc. 2, 71, also with ἐκ Mtth. 830) ; ῥύεσθαι ἀπό Matt. vi. 13 (2 Sam. xix. 9 ; Ps. xvi. 13 f.), with ἐκ Luke i. 74 ; Rom. vii. 24, etc., Exod. vi. 6 ; Job xxxiii. 30 ; Ps. lxxviii. 15 ; σώζειν ἀπό Rom. v. 9 (Ps. lxxviii. 15), and more frequently with ἐκ, as in Jas. v. 20 ; Heb. v. 7 (2 Sam. xxii. 3 f. ; 1 Kings xix. 17) ; λυτροῦν ἀπό Tit. ii. 14 ; Ps. cxviii. 134 (but λ. τινος Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 710) ; καθαρῶς ἀπό 1 Jno. i. 7 ; 2 Cor. vii. 1 ; Heb. ix. 14, accordingly καθαρὸς ἀπό Acts xx. 26, cf. Tob. iii. 14 ; Demosth. Neaer. 528 c. (with ἐκ Appian. Syr. 59) and ἀθῶος ἀπό (ἡ ἡ) Matt. xxvii. 24, cf. Krebs, observ. 73 ; Gen. xxiv. 41 ; Num. v. 19, 31, with Dat. Josh. ii. 17, 19 f. ; similarly λούειν ἀπό (concisely for *by washing cleanse from*) Acts xvi. 33 ; Rev. i. 5.

b. Where the construction with the Genitive alone is also used ; as, ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐκ τῶν κόπων Rev. xiv. 13, παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ 1 Pet. iii. 10 (Esth. ix. 16 ; Soph. Electr. 987 ; Thuc. 7, 186 73) ; ὑστερεῖν ἀπό Heb. xii. 15 is probably a pregnant construction. ^{7th ed.}

The notion of *separation* and *removal* lies at the basis also of the Hellenistic construction κρύπτειν (τι) ἀπό τινος Luke xix. 42 (for which classic authors use κρύπτειν τινά τι) ; it is properly a constructio praeagnans (cf. Sept. Gen. iv. 14 ; xviii. 17 ; 1 Sam. iii. 18, etc.). To verbs of *remaining behind* anything (ὑστερεῖν τινος) may be referred 2 Pet. iii. 9 οὐ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (οὐ βραδύς ἐστι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας), cf. ὑστέρον τῆς βοηθείας Diod. S. 13, 110. Even the Syriac has joined ἐπαγγ. with βραδ.

7. The Genitive of *proceeding from* and of *derivation* occurs in prose in its simplest form in ἀρχομαί τινος I begin *from* (with) something (Hartung, 14), δέχομαί τινος I receive *from* somebody (Hm. Vig. 877), δέομαί τινος I beg *of* some one (Mtth. 834), ἀκούω τινός I hear *from* somebody ; then γεύομαί, ἐσθίω τινός (e.g. ἄρτου, μέλιτος) I taste, eat, *of* something, ὀνίνημι τινος I derive advantage, enjoyment, *from* something ; finally δίδωμι τινος, λαμβάνω τινός I give, take, *of* something ; Hm. Opusc. I. 178. The Genitive denotes in all these cases the object out of which *hearing, eating, giving* etc. comes ;

καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς. Still I agree with Mey. in thinking this reading (which most probably is an error of the transcribers, see Bengel) too weak for the style of the passage.

from which that proceeds which is eaten, tasted, given, etc.; and, in the last expressions, indicates the mass, the whole, of which a part is enjoyed, given, etc. Consequently these Genitives may be regarded also as Genitivi partitivi; for when the whole, or the object simply, is meant, the strict Object-case, the Accusative, is used. In the diction of the N. T. the Genitive, in many of those constructions, is strengthened by a preposition. As respects details we notice,

a. *δέομαι* has without exception the Genitive of the person (Matt. ix. 38; Luke v. 12; viii. 28; Acts viii. 22, etc.), the object of request being subjoined in the Acc.; as, 2 Cor. viii. 4 *δεόμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν χάριν* etc. (Weber, Demosth. p. 163).

b. Of verbs of *giving* with the Genitive we have only *one* instance, Rev. ii. 17 *δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα* (where some Codd. have δ. *α. φαγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ μ.* as a correction).¹ On the other hand, in Rom. i. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 8 the apostle could not have written *μεταδίδοναι χαρίσματος* or *εὐαγγελίου* (Mtth. 798), as in the first passage a particular charisma as a whole (in fact he says *χάρισμά τι*) is meant; and in the second, the Gospel as something indivisible. Paul did not purpose to communicate a portion of (*from*) a spiritual gift, or a portion of (*from*) the Gospel.

c. Verbs of *enjoying* or *partaking*: *προσλαμβάνεσθαι τροφῆς* Acts xxvii. 36, *μεταλαμβάνειν τροφῆς* Acts ii. 46; xxvii. 33 f., *γεύεσθαι τοῦ δείπνου* Luke xiv. 24 (figuratively Heb. vi. 4 *γεύεσθαι τῆς δωρεᾶς* 187 *τ. ἐπουρανίου, γεύεσθαι θανάτου* Matt. xvi. 28; Luke ix. 27; Heb. ii. 7th ed. 9, etc.), and with Gen. of pers. Philem. 20 *ἐγὼ σου ὀναίμην ἐν κυρίῳ* (cf. also Odys. 19, 68), Rom. xv. 24 *ἐὰν ὑμῶν ... ἐμπλησθῶ*. But *γεύεσθαι* governs also the Acc.: Jno. ii. 9 *ἐγένεσας τὸ ὕδωρ*, 179 Heb. vi. 5² (as frequently in Hebraizing Greek, Job. xii. 11; Sirach 6th ed. xxxvi. 24; Tob. vii. 11; but probably never in Greek authors).³

¹ This very passage clearly shows the distinction between the Genitive and the Acc., for καὶ δώσω ψῆφον λευκὴν follows; cf. Heliod. 2, 23, 100 *ἐπερβόρουν δὲ μὲν τοῦ ὕδατος, δὲ δὲ καὶ οἶνον*.

² Bengel, on Heb. vi. 4, appears to trifle in attempting to make a distinction in this passage between *γεύεσθαι* with the Gen. and with the Acc.

³ In the sense of *eating up, consuming*, *φαγεῖν* and *ἐσθίειν* have regularly the Acc. (Matt. xii. 4; Rev. x. 10): cf., for distinction, 1 Cor. ix. 7. They also take the Acc. when one's food in general, merely, is described, — of which he ordinarily makes use, which he lives upon; e.g. Mark i. 6 *ἦν Ἰωάννης ... ἐσθίων ἀκριδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον*, Rom. xiv. 21; Matt. xv. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 7; x. 3 f. (Jno. vi. 58), cf. Diog. L. 6, 45. It may be stated generally, that *ἐσθίειν τι* would in no passage be found to be entirely without justification (cf. even 2 Thess. iii. 12) and thus the absence of *ἐσθίειν τινός* (together with *ἀπὸ* or *ἐκ τίνος*) would cease to be strange. Luke xv. 16 *ἀπὸ τῶν κερατίων ὧν ἔσθιον οἱ χοῖροι* is probably an attraction. Besides, we find *ἐσθίειν, πίνειν τι* regularly in the Sept. also; only in Num. xx. 19 *ἐὰν τοῦ ὕδατος σου πίνωμεν* occurs.

Verbs of *eating of* as well as *giving* and *taking of* are, moreover, 212 in the N. T. invariably joined to their nouns by prepositions :

a) By *ἀπό* ; as, Luke xxiv. 42 ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ... ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου, xx. 10 ; Matt. xv. 27 τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν παιδιῶν (cf. ἡ βῆξ and φαγεῖν ἀπό Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 706), Luke xxii. 18 οὐ μὴ πῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, cf. Jer. li. (xxviii.) 7, Acts ii. 17 ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τ. πνεύματός μου (LXX.), v. 2 καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, Jno. xxi. 10 ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφάρων, Mark xii. 2 ἵνα ... λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος.

b) By *ἐκ* ; as, 1 Cor. xi. 28 ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω, ix. 7 (2 Sam. xii. 3 ; 2 Kings iv. 40 ; Sir. xi. 17 ; Judith xii. 2) ; Jno. iv. 14 ὃς ἂν πίνη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος,¹ vi. 50 ὁ ἄρτος ... ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ, 1 Jno. iv. 13 ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν. But we must not refer to this head Heb. xiii. 10 φαγεῖν ἐκ θυσιαστηρίου, as if it were equivalent to ἐκ θυσίας ; for θυσιαστ. means altar. To eat of the altar is simply equivalent to, of the sacrifice (offered on the altar). Probably there is no instance of ἐσθίειν ἀπό or ἐκ in classic Greek ; but ἀπολαύειν ἀπό τινος is akin to it, Plat. rep. 3, 395 c. ; 10, 606 b. ; Apol. 31 b.

c) Of verbs of *perceiving*, ἀκούω is construed with the Genitive of the person (to hear *from*—*out of*—one), to hear one ; as, Matt. xvii. 5 ; Mark vii. 14 ; Luke ii. 46 ; Jno. iii. 29 ; ix. 31 ; Rev. vi. 1, 3 ; Rom. x. 14²—(the object is expressed in the Acc., Acts i. 4 ἦν ἡκούσατέ μου, Lucian. dial. deor. 20, 13). Yet we find likewise ἀκούειν 188 τι ἀπό in 1 Jno. i. 5, ἐκ in 2 Cor. xii. 6 (also Odyss. 15, 374), παρά 7th ed. in Acts x. 22, where in classic Greek the Gen. alone would have been sufficient. A Genitive of the thing occurs with ἀκούω in Jno. v. 25 ; Heb. iv. 7 ἀκ. φωνῆς, Luke xv. 25 ἤκουσε συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν, Mark xiv. 64 ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας, 1 Macc. x. 34 ; Bar. iii. 4 (Lucian. Halc. 2 ; gall. 10 ; Xen. C. 6, 2, 13, etc.). On the 180 other hand, the Accusative follows in Luke v. 1 ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον 6th ed. 213 τ. θεοῦ, Jno. viii. 40 τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἣν ἤκουσα παρά τ. θεοῦ etc. In the last passages the object is referred to as a connected whole, and the hearing meant is intellectual ; while in the previous passages

¹ Otherwise in 1 Cor. x. 4 ἐπινον ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, where Platt's explanation is a failure.

² Others, Rück. and Fr., take the Genitive of the person here οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν thus : of whom (de quo) they have not heard (as ἀκούειν τινός is used also in Iliad. 24, 490). This does not appear to me probable (the construction in this sense is entirely poetical), much less necessary : one hears Christ when one hears the Gospel in which he speaks ; and thus ἀκούειν Χριστόν Eph. iv. 21 is said of those who have not heard Christ in person. Philippi on the passage is superficial.

the object is primarily certain sounds only, or words received by the bodily ear. Cf. Rost 532 f.

The Genitive with *τυγχάνειν* (*ἐπιτυγχάνειν*) which invariably occurs in the N. T. (on the Acc. see Hm. Vig. 762; Bhdy. 176),¹ as in Luke xx. 35; Acts xxiv. 3; xxvii. 3, etc., is perhaps in its origin to be explained by the preceding rule; yet we find it also where the *whole* object is meant. In the same way the earlier Greek authors almost always construe *κληρονομεῖν* (*inherit*, also *participate in*) with the Genitive (Kypke II. 381), but the later and the N. T. writers connect with it the Accusative of the thing; as, Matt. v. 4; xix. 29; Gal. v. 21 (Polyb. 15, 22, 3) see Fischer-Well. III. I. 368; Lob. Phryn. 129; Mth. 802.

Λαγχάνειν has the Accusative in Acts i. 17; 2 Pet. i. 1 *ἰσότημον ἡμῶν λαχοῦσι πίστιν* (where *πίστις* does not mean faith in an ideal sense, the faith in which every Christian gets a share by his conversion, but the subjective faith of *these* Christians) Mth. 801. But in Luke i. 9 the Gen. is used (*to obtain by lot*); cf. Brunck, Soph. Electr. 364; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 803.

8. In the foregoing examples we already perceive that the notion of *proceeding from* something slides over into that of *participation in* something; but the partitive import of the Genitive is still more plainly disclosed in such combinations as *μετέχειν τινός, πληροῦν τινος, θυγγάνειν τινός*. With the Genitive are construed,

a. Words that express the notion of *having a share, partaking, wanting* (wishing to partake) Mth. 797; as, *κοινωνεῖν* Heb. ii. 14, *κοινωνός* 1 Cor. x. 18; 1 Pet. v. 1, *συγκοινωνός* Rom. xi. 17, *μετέχειν* 1 Cor. ix. 12; x. 21; Heb. v. 13, *μεταλαμβάνειν* Heb. vi. 7; xii. 10, *μέτοχος* Heb. iii. 1, also *χρῆζειν*² Matt. vi. 32; 2 Cor. iii. 1, etc., *προσδεῖσθαι* Acts xvii. 25. But *κοινωνεῖν* also takes — and in the 189 N. T. more commonly — the Dat. of the thing; as, 1 Tim. v. 22 *μη*
7th ed. *κοινωνεῖ ἀμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις*, Rom. xv. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 Jno. 11
214 (Wis. vi. 25), and in a transitive acceptation *εἰς*, Phil. iv. 15 *οὐδε-*
μία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως. Cf. Plat. rep. 5, 453 b.
δυνατὴ φύσις ἢ θήλεια τῇ τοῦ ἄρρενος γένους κοινωνῆσαι εἰς ἅπαντα
τὰ ἔργα. Act. Apocr. p. 91. The Dat. of the thing with *κοινωνεῖν*
and *μετέχειν* sometimes occurs in Greek authors (Thuc. 2, 16;
Demosth. cor. c. 18) Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 77; and, in respect to
κοινωνεῖν, is to be explained probably from the notion of *community*
implied in the word (1 Tim., as above, cannot be resolved into

¹ But according to good authorities [Sin. also] *ἐπιτυγχάνειν* has the Acc. in Rom. xi. 7; see Fr.

² Though in Luke xi. 8 several Codd. have *δσον χρῆζει*, neither from this, nor from the construction *χρῆζειν τι* (Mth. 834), should it be concluded, as is done by Kühnöl, that *χρ.* is construed with the Acc. also (in the sense of *desiring, demanding*).

μηδέν σοι καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἄλλοτρ. κοινὸν ἔστω). Further, 181
μετέχειν is once construed with the interposition of ἐκ, 1 Cor. x. 17 ^{6th ed.}
ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. I am not aware that a similar instance
is to be found in any Greek author.

b. Words of *abounding, filling, being empty, wanting* (Mtth. 826 ff.); as, Rom. xv. 13 ὁ θεὸς πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πύσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης, Luke i. 53 πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν, Acts v. 28 πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν (ii. 28 Sept.), Jno. ii. 7 γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος (vi. 13), Matt. xxii. 10 ἐπλήσθη ὁ γάμος ἀνακειμένων (Acts xix. 29), Jno. i. 14 πλήρης χάριτος, 2 Pet. ii. 14 ὀφθαλμοὶ μεστοὶ μοιχαλίδος, Luke xi. 39 τὸ ἔσθωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας, Jas. i. 5 εἴ τις ἡμῶν λείπεται σοφίας (Matthiae, Eurip. Hippol. 323), Rom. iii. 23 πάντες ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Lob. Phryn. p. 237), see also Acts xiv. 17; xxvii. 38; Luke xv. 17; xxii. 35; Jno. xix. 29; Rom. xv. 14, 24; Rev. xv. 8. Verbs of fulness are but rarely joined to ἀπό (Luke xv. 16 ἐπεθύμει γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν κερατιῶν, xvi. 21) or ἐκ (γεμίζειν ἐκ Rev. viii. 5; χορτάζ. ἐκ Rev. xix. 21, but χορτάζειν τινός Lam. iii. 15, 29, μεθύνειν and μεθύσκεσθαι ἐκ Rev. xvii. 2, 6 cf. Lucian. dial. d. 6, 3).² Altogether solecistic is Rev. xvii. 3 γέμον τὰ ὀνόματα cf. 4. [This solecism is probably to be explained by the analogy of πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσ. Phil. i. 11 and the like.] The Dat. after πληροῦν, μεθύσκεσθαι etc. rests on a conception essentially different; see § 31, 7. How 1 Cor. i. 7 ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματος must be taken, is obvious; cf. Plat. rep. 6, 484 d.

c. Verbs of *touching* (Mtth. 803) so far forth as the touching 190
affects only a *part* of the object; as, Mark v. 30 ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων ^{7th ed.}
(vi. 56; Luke xxii. 51; Jno. xx. 17; 2 Cor. vi. 17, etc.), Heb. xii. 20 ²¹⁵
καὶν θηρίον θίγη τοῦ δρους (xi. 28). Under this head comes also
Luke xvi. 24 βάπτειν ὕδατος, Bhdy. 168 (βάπτειν εἰς ὕδωρ Plato, Tim. 73 e.; Ael. 14, 39).

d. Verbs of *laying hold of*, when only a *part* of the whole is taken hold of; as, Matt. xiv. 31 ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ,

¹ To this head may be referred also πλούσιος with the Gen. Eurip. Orest. 394. In the N. T., however, the preposition ἐν is always used; as, Eph. ii. 4 πλούσιος ἐν ἐλέει (rich in mercy), Jas. ii. 5. Cf. πλουτεῖν, πλουτίζεισθαι ἐν τινι 1 Tim. vi. 18; 1 Cor. i. 5, etc.

² On πληθύνειν ἀπὸ Athen. 13, 569 see Schweighaeus. add. et corrig. p. 478. In Matt. xxiii. 25 ἔσθωθεν γέμουνσιν (cup and platter) ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκрасίας is probably to be rendered: *they are filled from plunder*, their contents arise from plunder. Luke, on the other hand, transfers the *fulness* to the Pharisees themselves, and therefore writes: τὸ ἔσθωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς etc. Likewise ἐκ τῆς ὁσμῆς in Jno. xii. 3 ἡ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὁσμῆς τοῦ μύρου does not stand for the Genitive, but denotes that *whence* from the filling of the house came; it was filled from (by) the odor of the ointment (with fragrance).

cf. Theoph. ch. 4 (with his hand he could take hold of Peter, just in the act of sinking, by a part of the body only, perhaps by the arm), Luke ix. 47; in a different application Mark ix. 27 *κρατήσας αὐτὸν τῆς χειρός*, Acts iii. 7 *πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρός* (*by the hand*), cf. Plato, Parm. 126; Xen. A. 1, 6, 10; hence usually with the Genitive of a limb; as, Luke viii. 54 *κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς*, Acts xxiii. 19 (Isa. xli. 13; xlii. 6; Gen. xix. 16). On the other hand, *κρατεῖν* or *λαμβάνειν*, *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* *τινα* always denotes seize, apprehend *one*, i.e. his whole person; as, Matt. xii. 11; xiv. 3; 182 *6th ed.* xviii. 28; Acts ix. 27; xvi. 19; [xviii. 17. Yet it is doubtful whether *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* is ever joined to an Acc. of the person, since (according to the analogy of Luke xiv. 4 *ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτόν*) the Acc. in Acts ix. 27 is probably governed by *ἡγαγεν*, in xvi. 19 by *εἵλκυσαν*, in xviii. 17 by *ἐτυπτον*. See also Mey. on Acts ix. 27 (3d ed.), and Bttm. Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 140]. The same distinction is observed in the figurative use of these verbs; as, Genitive, Heb. ii. 16; Luke i. 54; 1 Tim. vi. 2 (Xen. C. 2, 3, 6); Accusative, 2 Thess. ii. 15; Col. ii. 19, etc. But *κρατεῖν* *hold fast* Heb. iv. 14 and vi. 18 and *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* *lay hold of* 1 Tim. vi. 12, 19 (Ael. 14, 27), are construed with the Genitive; in both instances, however, with reference to a good which is destined for many (*ὁμολογία*, *ἐλπίς*), and which the individual, for his respective part, holds fast or attains. See, in general, Mtth. 803 f. In an ideal sense *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* is construed with a double Genitive; as, Luke xx. 20 *ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγον* *that they might catch him by a word*, 26 *ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος*-(cf. literally Xen. A. 4, 7, 12). Lastly, to this head is to be referred the construction *ἔχεσθαι* *τινος*, *hold by*, *adhere to* anything (*pendere ex*), Bleek, Heb. II. II. 220 f.; Mtth. 803, and *ἀντέχεσθαι* *τινος*. Both these verbs are thus used in the N. T. only in a figurative sense; as, Heb. vi. 9 *τὰ κρείσσονα καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας*, Matt. vi. 24 *τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἐτέρου καταφρονήσει*, 1 Thess. v. 14 *ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν*, Tit. i. 9 *ἀντεχόμενος τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου*. Also *ἀνέχεσθαι* *τινος* *endure any thing* or *any one*, comes under this head, for it denotes properly *to hold by* a person or thing (Matt. xvii. 17; Heb. xiii. 22; Eph. iv. 2), cf. Kypke II. 93; likewise *ἐνοχός* (*ἐνεχόμενός*) *τινος*, as Matt. xxvi. 66 *ἐνοχος θανάτου*, or 1 Cor. xi. 27 *ἐνοχος τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου* (Jas. 216 ii. 10), for in all cases a being held by, bound to, something is expressed,—in the first passage, to a punishment which must be 191 suffered, in the second, to a matter for which satisfaction is due. 7th ed. See Fr. Mt. p. 223; Bleek, Hebr. II. I. 340 f.; cf. § 31, pp. 210, 213.

Note 1. The partitive Genitive is sometimes governed by an adverb ; as, Heb. ix, 7 *ἅπας τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ* *once a year*, [Matt. xxviii. 1 *ὅψε σαββάτων*], Luke xviii. 12 ; xvii. 4 (Ptol. geogr. 8, 15, 19 ; 8, 29, 31 ; 8, 16, 4, etc.) cf. Mdv. 54.

Note 2. The partitive Genitive occurs not merely in dependence, it also makes its appearance sometimes as subject ; as, Xen. A. 3, 5, 16 *ὅποτε . . . σπείσαιντο καὶ ἐπιμίγνυσθαι σφῶν τε πρὸς ἐκείνους καὶ ἐκείνων πρὸς αὐτοὺς* *and (some) of them have intercourse with those ; of those, with them*, Thuc. 1, 115 (Theophan. I. 77). In the N. T. a similar construction occurs in Acts xxi. 16 *συνῆλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν σὺν ἡμῶν* (cf. Pseudarist. p. 120 Haverc. *ἐν οἷς καὶ βασιλικοὶ ἦσαν καὶ τῶν τιμωμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως*). In such cases, however, the Genitive is regularly accompanied by a preposition ; as, Jno. xvi. 17 *εἶπον ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ* etc.

9. Moreover, the Genitive is easily to be recognized as the *whence* case when joined

a. to verbs of *accusing, arraigning (sentencing)* as Genitive of the thing (Mtth. 848), e.g. Acts xix. 40 *κινδυνεύομεν ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως*, xxv. 11 *οὐδὲν ἐστιν ὧν οὗτοι κατηγοροῦσίν μου*, Luke xxiii. 14 *οὐδὲν εὗρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ' αὐτοῦ* (yet we find also *περί τίνος de aliqua re* Acts xxiii. 29 ; xxiv. 13, cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 2, like *κρίνεσθαι περί τίνος* Acts xxiii. 6 ; xxiv. 21) ; for the offence of which one is accused is that *from, out of* which the *κατηγορεῖν* arises, or proceeds. We must not, however, fail to mention that the two preceding verbs are usually in Greek authors construed differently, viz. *κατηγορεῖν τινός τι* (a construction which can hardly be proved to occur in the N. T. from Mark xv. 3, cf. Lucian. necyom. 19) and *ἐγκαλεῖν τινί τι* Mtth. 849 f.¹

b. to *κατακαυχᾶσθαι* *boast one's self of a thing (borrow glory from something)* Jas. ii. 13. On the other hand, the construction *ἐπαινεῖν τινά τινος* (4 Macc. i. 10 ; iv. 4 ; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 661) does not occur in the N. T. ; for in Luke xvi. 8 *τῆς ἀδικίας* is undoubtedly to be joined to *οἰκονόμος*, and the object of *ἐπαινεῖν* is expressed only in the clause *ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν*. In general, 217 see on the former construction (Sintenis) in the Leipz. L. Z. 1833, I. 1135. Like *ἐπαινεῖν* the verb *μισεῖν* has in later Greek the Genitive of the thing (Liban. Oratt. p. 120 d. ; Cantacuz. I. 56).

c. to verbs signifying to *emit an odor (smell, breathe hard)*, Mtth.

¹ How *κατηγορεῖν* (properly, maintain, assert against one) comes by the Genitive of a person (Matt. xii. 10 ; Luke xxiii. 2, etc.), is obvious ; but *καταγινώσκειν τινός* 1 Jno. iii. 20 f. is construed exactly in the same manner (Mtth. 860). Instead of *ἐγκαλεῖν τινί* (Sir. xlvi. 19) we find in Rom. viii. 33 *ἐγκαλ. κατὰ τινος*, which is as easily accounted for as *κατηγορεῖν εἰς τινα* Maetzner, Antiph. 207.

856; for in *δξεν τινός* the Genitive denotes the substance *from* which the *δξεν* emanates. In the N. T. this Gen. occurs only in a figurative sense, Acts ix. 1 *ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου panting with,*
 192 *breathing of, threatening and slaughter*, cf. Aristoph. eq. 437 οὔτος ἤδη
 7th ed. *κακίας καὶ συκοφαντίας πνεῖ* Heliod. 1, 2; Ephraem. 2358. Different from this are *φόνον πνέοντες* Theocr. 22, 82, *θυμὸν ἐκπνέων* Eurip. Bacch. 620, where the direct object is expressed: *breathing murder, courage*, the verbs being used as transitive.

10. The Genitive appears to be removed a little farther from its original import, when joined

a. to verbs of *feeling*, in order to denote the object *towards* which the feeling is directed; as, *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι τινος* Matt. xviii. 27. But in German also, *sich jemandes erbarmen*, we find the Genitive construction; and in Greek the object was unquestionably conceived as operating upon the feeling subject, consequently, as the point *from* which the feeling proceeds, i.e. is generated. Most verbs of this kind, however, are construed with the Acc., conformably to a different conception of the relation; see § 32, 1 and Hartung, S. 20.

b. to verbs of *longing* and *desiring* (Mtth. 824 f.), where we commonly say, long *for* something, hanker *after*, etc. But the Greek conception of *ἐπιθυμεῖν τινος* (except in connections where the Gen. can be taken partitively, as *ἐπιθυμ. σοφίας*, to desire *of* wisdom) was such that the longing, the desire, proceeds from the good in question,—the good things *of themselves* entice men to longing. In the N. T. *ἐπιθυμεῖν* invariably (in Matt. v. 28 alone we find a var.) takes the Genitive; as, Acts xx. 33 *ἀργυρίου*
 184 *ἡ χρυσίου ἡ ἱματισμοῦ οὐδενὸς ἐπεθύμησα* (1 Tim. iii. 1), so also
 6th ed. *ὀρέγεσθαι* 1 Tim. iii. 1 *εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ* (Isocr. Demon. p. 24 *ὀρεχθῆναι τῶν καλῶν ἔργων* Lucian. Tim. 70), Heb. xi. 16, and *ἰμείρεσθαι* 1 Thess. ii. 8. Likewise in the Sept. and the Apocrypha (Wisd. vi. 12; 1 Macc. iv. 17; xi. 11, etc.) we find *ἐπιθυμεῖν τινος* the rule (*ὀρέγεσθαι* does not occur there at all), though the verb already begins to be joined as transitive to the Acc. Exod. xx. 17; Deut. v. 21; vii. 25; Mic. ii. 2; Job xxxiii. 20, cf. Wisd. xvi. 3; Eccclus. xvi. 1. The verb *ἐπιποθεῖν* appears constantly with the Acc. even in the earlier Greek (because the
 218 construction was thus resolved in thought: *ποθεῖν* or *πόθον ἔχειν ἐπὶ τι*, *after* something, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 31), Plat. legg. 9, 855 c.; Diod. S. 17, 101; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 14; Phil. i. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 2. Likewise *πεινῆν* and *διψῆν*, which in Greek authors regularly take the

Genitive, are joined in the N. T. in a figurative sense (in reference to spiritual blessings) with the Acc. (*φιλοσοφίαν διψ.* Epist. Socr. 25 p. 53 Allat.) Matt. v. 6 *πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες δικαιοσύνην*.¹ The difference between these two constructions is obvious: *διψ. φιλοσοφίας* means *to have a thirst for philosophy*, while *διψ. φιλοσοφίαν* represents philosophy as something indivisible which one wishes to get possession of. 193
7th ed.

Next to the verbs already mentioned follow, c. those of *thinking of, remembering* (Mtth. 820); as, Luke xvii. 32 *μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Δάτ*, [1 Thess. i. 3], Luke i. 72 *μνησθῆναι διαθήκης*, Acts xi. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 2; Luke xxiii. 42; Heb. xiii. 2; Jude 17; 2 Pet. iii. 2 (also *ὑπομνήσκειν τιὰ περί τινος* 2 Pet. i. 12). We, too, say: *einer Sache gedenken*, think of a matter, for this process is simply the seizing, laying hold of, a particular with the memory. Correspondingly, in the case of *forgetting* a thing, Heb. xii. 5 *ἐκλέλυσθε τῆς παρακλήσεως*, vi. 10 *ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν*, xiii. 2, 16. But *ἀναμνήσκεισθαι* Heb. x. 32; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Mark xiv. 72 and *μνημονεύειν* Matt. xvi. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xviii. 5 often govern the Accusative (Mtth. 820), yet rather in the sense of *having present in the mind*, holding in remembrance (Bhdy. 177); *ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι* likewise is joined to this case in Phil. iii. 14, so sometimes in the Sept. (Deut. iv. 9; 2 Kings xvii. 38; Isa. lxn. 16; Wisd. ii. 4; Ecclus. iii. 14), and even in Attic (Mtth. 821). This double construction rests on a different view of the relation, of which there is a glimpse also in Latin. Verbs of *mentioning* do not take the Genitive in the N. T.; but we find, instead, *μνημον. περί* Heb. xi. 22 (cf. *μυμήσκεισθαι περί* Xen. C. 1, 6, 12; Plut. paedag. 9, 27; Tob. iv. 1).

d. Further, the transition is easy to verbs of *caring for or neglecting* (Mtth. 821), Luke x. 34 *ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ* (1 Tim. iii. 5), 1 Cor. ix. 9 *μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ*; (Acts xviii. 17; Plut. paedag. 17, 22), Tit. iii. 8 *ἵνα φροντίζωσι καλῶν ἔργων*, 1 Tim. v. 8 *τῶν ἰδίων οὐ προνοεῖ*, 1 Tim. iv. 14 *μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος* (Heb. ii. 3), Heb. xii. 5 *μὴ ὀλνγῶρει παιδείας κυρίου*. Under this head comes also *φειδεσθαι* (Mtth. 822),² Acts xx. 29 *μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου* not *sparing the flock*, 1 Cor. vii. 28; 2 Pet. ii. 4. etc. 185
8th ed.

¹ In the Sept. this verb is found with the Dat. Ex. xvii. 3 *ἐδίψησεν ὁ λαὸς ὕδατι* (for water). Likewise in Ps. lxii. 2 the Cod. Vat. has *ἐδίψησέ σοι* (θεῷ, al. σε) *ἡ ψυχὴ μου*.

² In Latin *parcere alicui*. But in the Greek *φειδεσθαι*, judging from the construction, lies rather the notion of restraining one's self from, *sibi temperare* etc. In the Sept., however, this verb also takes the Dative, and is construed with prepositions.

c. The Genitive of a quality in which one participates (sing. abstract), in diversified applications, 1 Cor. xiv. 33 οὐκ ἔστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεός, Heb. x. 39 ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς . . . ἀλλὰ πίστεως etc. (Plato, apol. 28 a.). Likewise the concrete Gen. Acts ix. 2 τινὰς τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, particularly the Genitive of age, Mark v. 42 ἦν ἐτῶν δώδεκα, Luke ii. 42; iii. 23; Acts iv. 22; Tob. xiv. 2, 11; Plato, legg. 4, 721 a. In these passages the subject is a person, but in the following it is a thing: Heb. xii. 11 πᾶσα παιδεία οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι *is not (matter) of joy* (this, however, might be referred also to a.), 2 Pet. i. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλήσεως οὐ γίνεται. Moreover, this construction of εἶμι, when persons are the subject, is sometimes made more animated, in Oriental style, by the insertion of υἱός or τέκνον; cf. 1 Thess. v. 5 ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας.¹

The same relations are expressed by the Genitive when the verb εἶναι is omitted, Phil. iii. 5 ἐγὼ . . . φυλῆς Βενιαμίν.

6. The Genitive, as the clearly defined case of *departure, motion* 185 *whence*, appears, too, in the diction of the N. T., joined to verbs 7th ed. (and adjectives), with a diversity of application natural to this rela- 177 tion. (This diversity, however, is more copious in Greek prose, and 6th ed. in the N. T. the Gen. is frequently strengthened by prepositions.) As *separation* from is related to proceeding from, and as that which departs and is separated may often be conceived as a *part* of the remaining whole, the Genitive, because the case of proceeding from, is also naturally the case of *separation* and of *partition*. The former, the Genitive of *separation* and *removal*, as the more limited, we shall illustrate first.

As words which express the idea of separation or removal are usually construed with the Genitive by the Greeks even in prose,—e.g. ἐλευθεροῦν τινος to free *from* something, κωλύειν, ὑποχωρεῖν, παύειν, διαφέρειν, ὑστερεῖν τινος, see Mtth. 829 ff., 845; Bhdy. 179 f. (although in such circumstances suitable prepositions are pretty frequently inserted),—so in the N. T. also the following verbs are construed with the Genitive: μετασταθῆναι Luke xvi. 4, ἀστοχεῖν 1 Tim. i. 6, παύεσθαι 1 Pet. iv. 1, κωλύειν Acts xxvii. 43 (cf. Xen. C. 2, 4, 23; Anab. 1, 6, 2; Pol. 2, 52, 8 a.), διαφέρειν Matt. x. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 41 etc. (Xen. C. 8, 2, 21, cf. Krü. Dion. H. p. 462), ἀπο- 210 στερεῖσθαι 1 Tim. vi. 5,² also ὑστερεῖν to be behind one 2 Cor. xi. 5;

¹ We Germans also say both *du bist des Todes* and *du bist ein Kind des Todes*. But this does not prove that the former expression is elliptical (*Kuinoel* ad Heb. x. 39).

² *Lachm.*, on the authority of good Codd., has adopted in Acts xix. 27 . . . μάλλων τε

xii. 11, see Bleek on Heb. iv. 1 and ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν Eph. ii. 12.

The interposition of prepositions, however, predominates :

a. With verbs of *disjoining*, *freeing*, and *being free*, invariably (Mtth. 665; Bhdy. 181); as, χωρίζω ἀπό Rom. viii. 35; 1 Cor. vii. 10; Heb. vii. 26 (Plat. Phaed. 67 c., but Polyb. 5, 111, 2); λύειν ἀπό Luke xiii. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 27; ἐλευθεροῦν ἀπό Rom. vi. 18, 22; viii. 2, 21 (Thuc. 2, 71, also with ἐκ Mtth. 830); ῥύεσθαι ἀπό Matt. vi. 13 (2 Sam. xix. 9; Ps. xvi. 13 f.), with ἐκ Luke i. 74; Rom. vii. 24, etc., Exod. vi. 6; Job xxxiii. 30; Ps. lxxviii. 15; σώζειν ἀπό Rom. v. 9 (Ps. lxxviii. 15), and more frequently with ἐκ, as in Jas. v. 20; Heb. v. 7 (2 Sam. xxii. 3 f.; 1 Kings xix. 17); λυτροῦν ἀπό Tit. ii. 14; Ps. cxviii. 134 (but λ. τινος Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 710); καθαρίζειν ἀπό 1 Jno. i. 7; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Heb. ix. 14, accordingly καθαρὸς ἀπό Acts xx. 26, cf. Tob. iii. 14; Demosth. Neaer. 528 c. (with ἐκ Appian. Syr. 59) and ἀθῶος ἀπό (ἡ ἡ) Matt. xxvii. 24, cf. Krebs, observ. 73; Gen. xxiv. 41; Num. v. 19, 31, with Dat. Josh. ii. 17, 19 f.; similarly λύνειν ἀπό (concisely for *by washing cleanse from*) Acts xvi. 33; Rev. i. 5.

b. Where the construction with the Genitive alone is also used; as, ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐκ τῶν κόπων Rev. xiv. 13, παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ 1 Pet. iii. 10 (Esth. ix. 16; Soph. Electr. 987; Thuc. 7, 186 73); ὑστερεῖν ἀπό Heb. xii. 15 is probably a pregnant construction. 7th ed.

The notion of *separation* and *removal* lies at the basis also of the Hellenistic construction κρίπτειν (τι) ἀπό τινος Luke xix. 42 (for which classic 178 authors use κρίπτειν τινά τι); it is properly a constructio praeagnans (cf. Sept. 6th ed. Gen. iv. 14; xviii. 17; 1 Sam. iii. 18, etc.). To verbs of *remaining behind* anything (ὑστερεῖν τινος) may be referred 2 Pet. iii. 9 οὐ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (οὐ βραδύς ἐστι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας), cf. ὑστέρουν τῆς βοηθείας Diod. S. 13, 110. Even the Syriac has joined ἐπαγγ. with βραδ.

7. The Genitive of *proceeding from* and of *derivation* occurs in prose in its simplest form in ἀρχομαί τινος I begin *from* (with) something (Hartung, 14), δέχομαί τινος I receive *from* somebody (Hm. Vig. 877), δέομαί τινος I beg *of* some one (Mtth. 834), ἀκούω τινός I hear *from* somebody; then γεύομαί, ἐσθίω τινός (e.g. ἄρτου, μέλιτος) I taste, eat, *of* something, ὀνίνημι τινος I derive advantage, enjoyment, 211 *from* something; finally δίδωμι τινος, λαμβάνω τινός I give, take, *of* something; Hm. Opusc. I. 178. The Genitive denotes in all these cases the object out of which *hearing, eating, giving* etc. comes;

καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς. Still I agree with Mey. in thinking this reading (which most probably is an error of the transcribers, see Bengel) too weak for the style of the passage.

from which that proceeds which is eaten, tasted, given, etc.; and, in the last expressions, indicates the mass, the whole, of which a part is enjoyed, given, etc. Consequently these Genitives may be regarded also as Genitivi partitivi; for when the whole, or the object simply, is meant, the strict Object-case, the Accusative, is used. In the diction of the N. T. the Genitive, in many of those constructions, is strengthened by a preposition. As respects details we notice,

a. *δέομαι* has without exception the Genitive of the person (Matt. ix. 38; Luke v. 12; viii. 28; Acts viii. 22, etc.), the object of request being subjoined in the Acc.; as, 2 Cor. viii. 4 *δεόμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν χάριν* etc. (Weber, Demosth. p. 163).

b. Of verbs of *giving* with the Genitive we have only *one* instance, Rev. ii. 17 *δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα* (where some Codd. have δ. α. *φαγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ μ.* as a correction).¹ On the other hand, in Rom. i. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 8 the apostle could not have written *μεταδίδοναι χαρίσματος* or *εὐαγγελίου* (Mtth. 798), as in the first passage a particular charisma as a whole (in fact he says *χάρισμά τι*) is meant; and in the second, the Gospel as something indivisible. Paul did not purpose to communicate a portion of (*from*) a spiritual gift, or a portion of (*from*) the Gospel.

c. Verbs of *enjoying* or *partaking*: *προσλαμβάνεσθαι τροφῆς* Acts xxvii. 36, *μεταλαμβάνειν τροφῆς* Acts ii. 46; xxvii. 33 f., *γεύεσθαι τοῦ δείπνου* Luke xiv. 24 (figuratively Heb. vi. 4 *γεύεσθαι τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ ἐπουρανίου, γεύεσθαι θανάτου* Matt. xvi. 28; Luke ix. 27; Heb. ii. 187 *τ. ἐπουρανίου, γεύεσθαι θανάτου* Matt. xvi. 28; Luke ix. 27; Heb. ii. 7th ed. 9, etc.), and with Gen. of pers. Philem. 20 *ἐγὼ σοι ὀφειμὴν ἐν κυρίῳ* (cf. also Odyss. 19, 68), Rom. xv. 24 *ἐὰν ὑμῶν ... ἐμπλησθῶ*. But *γεύεσθαι* governs also the Acc.: Jno. ii. 9 *ἐγένεσας τὸ ὕδωρ*, 179 Heb. vi. 5² (as frequently in Hebraizing Greek, Job. xii. 11; Sirach 6th ed. xxxvi. 24; Tob. vii. 11; but probably never in Greek authors).³

¹ This very passage clearly shows the distinction between the Genitive and the Acc., for καὶ δώσω ψῆφον λευκὴν follows; cf. Heliod. 2, 23, 100 *ἐπερρόφουν δὲ μὲν τοῦ ὕδατος, δὲ δὲ καὶ σίτον*.

² Bengel, on Heb. vi. 4, appears to trifle in attempting to make a distinction in this passage between *γεύεσθαι* with the Gen. and with the Acc.

³ In the sense of *eating up, consuming, φαγεῖν* and *ἐσθίειν* have regularly the Acc. (Matt. xii. 4; Rev. x. 10): cf., for distinction, 1 Cor. ix. 7. They also take the Acc. when one's food in general, merely, is described, — of which he ordinarily makes use, which he lives upon; e.g. Mark i. 6 *ἦν Ἰωάννης ... ἐσθίων ἀκριβας καὶ μέλι ἀγρίου*, Rom. xiv. 21; Matt. xv. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 7; x. 3 f. (Jno. vi. 58), cf. Diog. L. 6, 45. It may be stated generally, that *ἐσθίειν τι* would in no passage be found to be entirely without justification (cf. even 2 Thess. iii. 12) and thus the absence of *ἐσθίειν τινός* (together with *ἀπὸ* or *ἐκ τινός*) would cease to be strange. Luke xv. 16 *ἀπὸ τῶν κερατίων ὧν ἔσθιον οἱ χοῖροι* is probably an attraction. Besides, we find *ἐσθίειν, πίνειν τι* regularly in the Sept. also; only in Num. xx. 19 *ἐὰν τοῦ ὕδατός σου πίνωμεν* occurs.

Verbs of *eating of* as well as *giving* and *taking of* are, moreover, 212 in the N. T. invariably joined to their nouns by prepositions :

a) By *ἀπό* ; as, Luke xxiv. 42 ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ . . . ἀπὸ μελίσσιου κηρίου, xx. 10 ; Matt. xv. 27 τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθλεί ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν παιδίων (cf. 72 23 and φαγεῖν ἀπό Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 706), Luke xxii. 18 οὐ μὴ πῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, cf. Jer. li. (xxviii.) 7, Acts ii. 17 ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τ. πνεύματος μου (LXX.), v. 2 καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, Jno. xxi. 10 ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, Mark xii. 2 ἵνα . . . λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος.

b) By *ἐκ* ; as, 1 Cor. xi. 28 ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω, ix. 7 (2 Sam. xii. 3 ; 2 Kings iv. 40 ; Sir. xi. 17 ; Judith xii. 2) ; Jno. iv. 14 δς ἂν πίνη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος,¹ vi. 50 ὁ ἄρτος . . . ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ, 1 Jno. iv. 13 ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν. But we must not refer to this head Heb. xiii. 10 φαγεῖν ἐκ θυσιαστηρίου, as if it were equivalent to ἐκ θυσίας ; for θυσιαστ. means altar. To eat of the altar is simply equivalent to, of the sacrifice (offered on the altar). Probably there is no instance of ἐσθlein ἀπό or ἐκ in classic Greek ; but ἀπολαύειν ἀπό τινος is akin to it, Plat. rep. 3, 395 c. ; 10, 606 b. ; Apol. 31 b.

c) Of verbs of *perceiving*, ἀκούω is construed with the Genitive of the person (to hear *from*—*out of*—one), to hear one ; as, Matt. xvii. 5 ; Mark vii. 14 ; Luke ii. 46 ; Jno. iii. 29 ; ix. 31 ; Rev. vi. 1, 3 ; Rom. x. 14²—(the object is expressed in the Acc., Acts i. 4 ἦν ἠκούσατέ μου, Lucian. dial. deor. 20, 13). Yet we find likewise ἀκούειν 188 τι ἀπό in 1 Jno. i. 5, ἐκ in 2 Cor. xii. 6 (also Odys. 15, 374), παρά 7th ed. in Acts x. 22, where in classic Greek the Gen. alone would have been sufficient. A Genitive of the thing occurs with ἀκούω in Jno. v. 25 ; Heb. iv. 7 ἀκ. φωνῆς, Luke xv. 25 ἤκουσε συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν, Mark xiv. 64 ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας, 1 Macc. x. 34 ; Bar. iii. 4 (Lucian. Halc. 2 ; gall. 10 ; Xen. C. 6, 2, 13, etc.). On the 180 other hand, the Accusative follows in Luke v. 1 ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον 6th ed. 213 τ. θεοῦ, Jno. viii. 40 τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τ. θεοῦ etc. In the last passages the object is referred to as a connected whole, and the hearing meant is intellectual ; while in the previous passages

¹ Otherwise in 1 Cor. x. 4 ἔπινον ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθοῦσης πέτρας, where *Flatt's* explanation is a failure.

² Others, *Rück.* and *Fr.*, take the Genitive of the person here οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν thus : of whom (de quo) they have not heard (as ἀκούειν τινός is used also in Iliad. 24, 490). This does not appear to me probable (the construction in this sense is entirely poetical), much less necessary : one hears Christ when one hears the Gospel in which he speaks ; and thus ἀκούειν Χριστόν Eph. iv. 21 is said of those who have not heard Christ in person. *Philippi* on the passage is superficial.

the object is primarily certain sounds only, or words received by the bodily ear. Cf. Rost 532 f.

The Genitive with *τυγχάνειν* (*ἐπιτυγχάνειν*) which invariably occurs in the N. T. (on the Acc. see Hm. Vig. 762; Bhdv. 176),¹ as in Luke xx. 35; Acts xxiv. 3; xxvii. 3, etc., is perhaps in its origin to be explained by the preceding rule; yet we find it also where the *whole* object is meant. In the same way the earlier Greek authors almost always construe *κληρονομῆν* (*inherit*, also *participate in*) with the Genitive (Kypke II. 381), but the later and the N. T. writers connect with it the Accusative of the thing; as, Matt. v. 4; xix. 29; Gal. v. 21 (Polyb. 15, 22, 3) see Fischer-Well. III. I. 368; Lob. Phryn. 129; Mthh. 802.

Λαγχάνειν has the Accusative in Acts i. 17; 2 Pet. i. 1 *ἰσότημον ἡμῶν λαχοῦσι πίστιν* (where *πίστις* does not mean faith in an ideal sense, the faith in which every Christian gets a share by his conversion, but the subjective faith of *these* Christians) Mthh. 801. But in Luke i. 9 the Gen. is used (*to obtain by lot*); cf. Brunck, Soph. Electr. 364; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 803.

8. In the foregoing examples we already perceive that the notion of *proceeding from* something slides over into that of *participation in* something; but the partitive import of the Genitive is still more plainly disclosed in such combinations as *μετέχειν τινός, πληροῦν τινος, θιγγάνειν τινός*. With the Genitive are construed,

a. Words that express the notion of *having a share, partaking, wanting* (wishing to partake) Mthh. 797; as, *κοινωνεῖν* Heb. ii. 14, *κοινωνός* 1 Cor. x. 18; 1 Pet. v. 1, *συγκοινωνός* Rom. xi. 17, *μετέχειν* 1 Cor. ix. 12; x. 21; Heb. v. 13, *μεταλαμβάνειν* Heb. vi. 7; xii. 10, *μέτοχος* Heb. iii. 1, also *χρῆζειν*² Matt. vi. 32; 2 Cor. iii. 1, etc., *προσδεῖσθαι* Acts xvii. 25. But *κοινωνεῖν* also takes — and in the 189 N. T. more commonly — the Dat. of the thing; as, 1 Tim. v. 22 *μὴ 7th ed. κοινωνῶναι ἁμαρτίαις ἄλλοτρίαις*, Rom. xv. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 Jno. 11 214 (Wisd. vi. 25), and in a transitive acceptation *εἰς*, Phil. iv. 15 *οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινωνήσεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως*. Cf. Plat. rep. 5, 453 b. *δυνατὴ φύσις ἢ θήλεια τῇ τοῦ ἄρρενος γένους κοινωνῆσαι εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα*. Act. Apocr. p. 91. The Dat. of the thing with *κοινωνεῖν* and *μετέχειν* sometimes occurs in Greek authors (Thuc. 2, 16; Demosth. cor. c. 18) Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 77; and, in respect to *κοινωνεῖν*, is to be explained probably from the notion of *community* implied in the word (1 Tim., as above, cannot be resolved into

¹ But according to good authorities [Sin. also] *ἐπιτυγχάνειν* has the Acc. in Rom. xi. 7; see Fr.

² Though in Luke xi. 8 several Codd. have *δοον χρῆζει*, neither from this, nor from the construction *χρῆζειν τι* (Mthh. 834), should it be concluded, as is done by Kühnöl, that *χρ.* is construed with the Acc. also (in the sense of *desiring, demanding*).

μηδέν σοι καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἄλλοτρ. κοινὸν ἔστω). Further, 181
μετέχειν is once construed with the interposition of ἐκ, 1 Cor. x. 17 ^{ed. ed.}
ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. I am not aware that a similar instance
is to be found in any Greek author.

b. Words of *abounding, filling, being empty, wanting* (Mtth. 826 ff.); as, Rom. xv. 13 ὁ θεὸς πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πύσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης, Luke i. 53 πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν, Acts v. 28 πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν (ii. 28 Sept.), Jno. ii. 7 γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος (vi. 13), Matt. xxii. 10 ἐπλήσθη ὁ γάμος ἀνακειμένων (Acts xix. 29), Jno. i. 14 πλήρης χάριτος, 2 Pet. ii. 14 ὀφθαλμοὶ μεστοὶ μοιχαλίδος, Luke xi. 39 τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας, Jas. i. 5 εἴ τις ἡμῶν λείπεται σοφίας (Matthiae, Eurip. Hippol. 323), Rom. iii. 23 πάντες ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Lob. Phryn. p. 237), see also Acts xiv. 17; xxvii. 38; Luke xv. 17; xxii. 35; Jno. xix. 29; Rom. xv. 14, 24; Rev. xv. 8. Verbs of fulness are but rarely joined to ἀπό (Luke xv. 16 ἐπεθύμει γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν κερατιῶν, xvi. 21) or ἐκ (γεμίζειν ἐκ Rev. viii. 5; χορτάζ. ἐκ Rev. xix. 21, but χορτάζειν τινός Lam. iii. 15, 29, μεθύνειν and μεθύσκεσθαι ἐκ Rev. xvii. 2, 6 cf. Lucian. dial. d. 6, 3).² Altogether solecistic is Rev. xvii. 3 γέμον τὰ ὀνόματα cf. 4. [This solecism is probably to be explained by the analogy of πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσ. Phil. i. 11 and the like.] The Dat. after πληροῦν, μεθύσκεσθαι etc. rests on a conception essentially different; see § 31, 7. How 1 Cor. i. 7 ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματος must be taken, is obvious; cf. Plat. rep. 6, 484 d.

c. Verbs of *touching* (Mtth. 803) so far forth as the touching 190
affects only a *part* of the object; as, Mark v. 30 ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων ^{1th ed.}
(vi. 56; Luke xxii. 51; Jno. xx. 17; 2 Cor. vi. 17, etc.), Heb. xii. 20 ²¹⁵
κἂν θηρίον θίγῃ τοῦ δρους (xi. 28). Under this head comes also
Luke xvi. 24 βάπτειν ὕδατος, Bhdy. 168 (βάπτειν εἰς ὕδωρ Plato, Tim. 73 e.; Ael. 14, 39).

d. Verbs of *laying hold of*, when only a *part* of the whole is taken hold of; as, Matt. xiv. 31 ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ,

¹ To this head may be referred also πλούσιος with the Gen. Eurip. Orest. 394. In the N. T., however, the preposition ἐν is always used; as, Eph. ii. 4 πλούσιος ἐν ἐλέει (rich in mercy), Jas. ii. 5. Cf. πλουτεῖν, πλουτίζεισθαι ἐν τι 1 Tim. vi. 18; 1 Cor. i. 5, etc.

² On πληθύνειν ἀπὸ Athen. 13, 569 see Schueighaeus. add. et corrig. p. 478. In Matt. xxiii. 25 ἔσωθεν γέμουνσιν (cup and platter) ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας is probably to be rendered: *they are filled from plunder, their contents arise from plunder.* Luke, on the other hand, transfers the *fulness* to the Pharisees themselves, and therefore writes: τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς etc. Likewise ἐκ τῆς ὁσμῆς in Jno. xii. 3 ἡ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὁσμῆς τοῦ μύρου does not stand for the Genitive, but denotes that *wherefrom* the filling of the house came; it was filled from (by) the odor of the ointment (with fragrance).

cf. Theoph. ch. 4 (with his hand he could take hold of Peter, just in the act of sinking, by a part of the body only, perhaps by the arm), Luke ix. 47; in a different application Mark ix. 27 *κρατήσας αὐτὸν τῆς χειρὸς*, Acts iii. 7 *πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς* (by the hand), cf. Plato, Parm. 126; Xen. A. 1, 6, 10; hence usually with the Genitive of a limb; as, Luke viii. 54 *κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς*, Acts xxiii. 19 (Isa. xli. 13; xlii. 6; Gen. xix. 16). On the other hand, *κρατεῖν* or *λαμβάνειν*, *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* *τινα* always denotes seize, apprehend *one*, i.e. his whole person; as, Matt. xii. 11; xiv. 3; 182 *ed.* xviii. 28; Acts ix. 27; xvi. 19; [xviii. 17. Yet it is doubtful whether *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* is ever joined to an Acc. of the person, since (according to the analogy of Luke xiv. 4 *ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτόν*) the Acc. in Acts ix. 27 is probably governed by *ἔργαζεν*, in xvi. 19 by *εἰλκυσαν*, in xviii. 17 by *ἐτυπτον*. See also Mey. on Acts ix. 27 (3d ed.), and Bttm. Gramm. des neustest. Sprachgebr. p. 140]. The same distinction is observed in the figurative use of these verbs; as, Genitive, Heb. ii. 16; Luke i. 54; 1 Tim. vi. 2 (Xen. C. 2, 3, 6); Accusative, 2 Thess. ii. 15; Col. ii. 19, etc. But *κρατεῖν* hold fast Heb. iv. 14 and vi. 18 and *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* lay hold of 1 Tim. vi. 12, 19 (Ael. 14, 27), are construed with the Genitive; in both instances, however, with reference to a good which is destined for many (*ὁμολογία*, *ἐλπίς*), and which the individual, for his respective part, holds fast or attains. See, in general, Mth. 803 f. In an ideal sense *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* is construed with a double Genitive; as, Luke xx. 20 *ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου* *that they might catch him by a word*, 26 *ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος* (cf. literally Xen. A. 4, 7, 12). Lastly, to this head is to be referred the construction *ἔχεσθαι τινος*, hold by, adhere to anything (*pendere ex*), Bleek, Heb. II. II. 220 f.; Mth. 803, and *ἀντέχεσθαι τινος*. Both these verbs are thus used in the N. T. only in a figurative sense; as, Heb. vi. 9 *τὰ κρείσσονα καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας*, Matt. vi. 24 *τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀντίκειται καὶ τοῦ ἐτέρου καταφρονήσει*, 1 Thess. v. 14 *ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν*, Tit. i. 9 *ἀντεχόμενος τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου*. Also *ἀνέχεσθαι τινος* endure any thing or any one, comes under this head, for it denotes properly to hold by a person or thing (Matt. xvii. 17; Heb. xiii. 22; Eph. iv. 2), cf. Kypke II. 93; likewise *ἐνοχός* (*ἐνεχόμενός*) *τινος*, as Matt. xxvi. 66 *ἐνοχὸς θανάτου*, or 1 Cor. xi. 27 *ἐνοχὸς τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου* (Jas. 216 ii. 10), for in all cases a being held by, bound to, something is expressed, — in the first passage, to a punishment which must be 191 suffered, in the second, to a matter for which satisfaction is due. 7th *ed.* See Fr. Mt. p. 223; Bleek, Hebr. II. I. 340 f.; cf. § 31, pp. 210, 213.

Note 1. The partitive Genitive is sometimes governed by an adverb; as, Heb. ix, 7 *ἅπας τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ* *once a year*, [Matt. xxviii. 1 ὅψι σαββάτων], Luke xviii. 12; xvii. 4 (Ptol. geogr. 8, 15, 19; 8, 29, 31; 8, 16, 4, etc.) cf. Mdv. 54.

Note 2. The partitive Genitive occurs not merely in dependence, it also makes its appearance sometimes as subject; as, Xen. A. 3, 5, 16 ὁπότε . . . σπείσονται καὶ ἐπιμίγνυσθαι σφῶν τε πρὸς ἐκείνους καὶ ἐκείνων πρὸς αὐτοὺς *and (some) of them have intercourse with those; of those, with them*, Thuc. 1, 115 (Theophan. I. 77). In the N. T. a similar construction occurs in Acts xxi. 16 συνήλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν σὺν ἡμῖν (cf. Pseudarist. p. 120 Haverc. ἐν οἷς καὶ βασιλικοὶ ἦσαν καὶ τῶν τιμωμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως). In such cases, however, the Genitive is regularly accompanied by a preposition; as, Jno. xvi. 17 εἶπον ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ etc.

9. Moreover, the Genitive is easily to be recognized as the *whence* case when joined

a. to verbs of *accusing, arraigning (sentencing)* as Genitive of the thing (Mtth. 848), e.g. Acts xix. 40 *κινδυνεύομεν ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως*, xxv. 11 οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ὧν οὗτοι κατηγοροῦσί μου, Luke xxiii. 14 οὐδὲν εὗρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ' αὐτοῦ (yet we find also *περί τινος de aliqua re* Acts xxiii. 29; xxiv. 13, cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 2, like *κρίνεσθαι περί τινος* Acts xxiii. 6; xxiv. 21); for the offence of which one is accused is that *from, out of* which the κατηγορεῖν arises, or proceeds. We must not, however, fail to mention that the two preceding verbs are usually in Greek authors construed differently, viz. κατηγορεῖν τινός τι (a construction which can hardly be proved to occur in the N. T. from Mark xv. 3, cf. Lucian. necyom. 19) and ἐγκαλεῖν τινί τι Mtth. 849 f.¹

b. to κατακαυχᾶσθαι *boast one's self of a thing (borrow glory from something)* Jas. ii. 13. On the other hand, the construction ἐπαινεῖν τινά τινος (4 Macc. i. 10; iv. 4; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 661) does not occur in the N. T.; for in Luke xvi. 8 τῆς ἀδικίας is undoubtedly to be joined to οἰκονόμος, and the object of ἐπαινεῖν is expressed only in the clause ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν. In general, see on the former construction (Sintenis) in the Leipz. L. Z. 1833, I. 1135. Like ἐπαινεῖν the verb μισεῖν has in later Greek the Genitive of the thing (Liban. Oratt. p. 120 d.; Cantacuz. I. 56).

c. to verbs signifying to *emit an odor (smell, breathe hard)*, Mtth.

¹ How κατηγορεῖν (properly, maintain, assert against one) comes by the Genitive of a person (Matt. xii. 10; Luke xxiii. 2, etc.), is obvious; but καταγινώσκειν τινός τι Jno. iii. 20 f. is construed exactly in the same manner (Mtth. 860). Instead of ἐγκαλεῖν τινι (Sir. xlv. 19) we find in Rom. viii. 33 ἐγκαλ. κατὰ τινος, which is as easily accounted for as κατηγορεῖν εἰς τινα Maetzner, Antiph. 207.

856; for in *δζειν τινός* the Genitive denotes the substance *from* which the *δζειν* emanates. In the N. T. this Gen. occurs only in a figurative sense, Acts ix. 1 *ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου panting with,*
 192 *breathing of, threatening and slaughter*, cf. Aristoph. eq. 437 *οὗτος ἤδη κακίας καὶ συκοφαντίας πνέει* Heliod. 1, 2; Ephraem. 2358. Different from this are *φόνον πνέοντες* Theocr. 22, 82, *θυμὸν ἐκπνέων* Eurip. Bacch. 620, where the direct object is expressed: *breathing murder*, courage, the verbs being used as transitive.

10. The Genitive appears to be removed a little farther from its original import, when joined

a. to verbs of *feeling*, in order to denote the object *towards* which the feeling is directed; as, *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι τινος* Matt. xviii. 27. But in German also, *sich jemandes erbarmen*, we find the Genitive construction; and in Greek the object was unquestionably conceived as operating upon the feeling subject, consequently, as the point *from* which the feeling proceeds, i.e. is generated. Most verbs of this kind, however, are construed with the Acc., conformably to a different conception of the relation; see § 32, 1 and Hartung, S. 20.

b. to verbs of *longing* and *desiring* (Mtth. 824 f.), where we commonly say, long *for* something, hanker *after*, etc. But the Greek conception of *ἐπιθυμεῖν τινος* (except in connections where the Gen. can be taken partitively, as *ἐπιθυμ. σοφίας*, to desire *of* wisdom) was such that the longing, the desire, proceeds from the good in question, — the good things *of themselves* entice men to longing. In the N. T. *ἐπιθυμεῖν* invariably (in Matt. v. 28 alone we find a var.) takes the Genitive; as, Acts xx. 33 *ἀργυρίου*
 184 *ἡ χρυσοῦ ἢ ἱματισμοῦ οὐδενὸς ἐπεθύμησα* (1 Tim. iii. 1), so also
 6th ed. *ὀρέγεσθαι* 1 Tim. iii. 1 *εἰ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ* (Isocr. Demon. p. 24 *ὀρεχθῆναι τῶν καλῶν ἔργων* Lucian. Tim. 70), Heb. xi. 16, and *ἡμεῖρεσθαι* 1 Thess. ii. 8. Likewise in the Sept. and the Apocrypha (Wisd. vi. 12; 1 Macc. iv. 17; xi. 11, etc.) we find *ἐπιθυμεῖν τινος* the rule (*ὀρέγεσθαι* does not occur there at all), though the verb already begins to be joined as transitive to the Acc. Exod. xx. 17; Deut. v. 21; vii. 25; Mic. ii. 2; Job xxxiii. 20, cf. Wisd. xvi. 3; Eccclus. xvi. 1. The verb *ἐπιποθεῖν* appears constantly with the Acc. even in the earlier Greek (because the
 218 construction was thus resolved in thought: *ποθεῖν* or *πόθον ἔχειν ἐπὶ τι*, *after* something, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 31), Plat. legg. 9, 855 e.; Diod. S. 17, 101; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 14; Phil. i. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 2. Likewise *πεινῆν* and *διψῆν*, which in Greek authors regularly take the

Genitive, are joined in the N. T. in a figurative sense (in reference to spiritual blessings) with the Acc. (*φιλοσοφίαν διψ.* Epist. Socr. 25 p. 53 Allat.) Matt. v. 6 *πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες δικαιοσύνην*.¹ The difference between these two constructions is obvious: *διψ. φιλοσοφίας* means *to have a thirst for philosophy*, while *διψ. φιλοσοφίαν* represents philosophy as something indivisible which one wishes to get possession of. 193
7th ed

Next to the verbs already mentioned follow, c. those of *thinking of, remembering* (Mtth. 820); as, Luke xvii. 32 *μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Δάτ*, [1 Thess. i. 3], Luke i. 72 *μνησθῆναι διαθήκης*, Acts xi. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 2; Luke xxiii. 42; Heb. xiii. 2; Jude 17; 2 Pet. iii. 2 (also *ὑπομνήσκειν τινὰ περί τινος* 2 Pet. i. 12). We, too, say: *einer Sache gedenken*, think of a matter, for this process is simply the seizing, laying hold of, a particular with the memory. Correspondingly, in the case of *forgetting* a thing, Heb. xii. 5 *ἐκλέλυσθε τῆς παρακλήσεως*, vi. 10 *ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν*, xiii. 2, 16. But *ἀναμνησκεισθαι* Heb. x. 32; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Mark xiv. 72 and *μνημονεύειν* Matt. xvi. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xviii. 5 often govern the Accusative (Mtth. 820), yet rather in the sense of *having present in the mind*, holding in remembrance (Bhdy. 177); *ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι* likewise is joined to this case in Phil. iii. 14, so sometimes in the Sept. (Deut. iv. 9; 2 Kings xvii. 38; Isa. lxxv. 16; Wisd. ii. 4; Ecclus. iii. 14), and even in Attic (Mtth. 821). This double construction rests on a different view of the relation, of which there is a glimpse also in Latin. Verbs of *mentioning* do not take the Genitive in the N. T.; but we find, instead, *μνημον. περί* Heb. xi. 22 (cf. *μυμήσκεσθαι περί* Xen. C. 1, 6, 12; Plut. paedag. 9, 27; Tob. iv. 1).

d. Further, the transition is easy to verbs of *caring for or neglecting* (Mtth. 821), Luke x. 34 *ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ* (1 Tim. iii. 5), 1 Cor. ix. 9 *μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ*; (Acts xviii. 17; Plut. paedag. 17, 22), Tit. iii. 8 *ἵνα φροντίζωσι καλῶν ἔργων*, 1 Tim. v. 8 *τῶν ἰδίων οὐ προνοεῖ*, 1 Tim. iv. 14 *μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος* (Heb. ii. 3), Heb. xii. 5 *μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου*. Under this head comes also *φείδεσθαι* (Mtth. 822),² Acts xx. 29 *μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου* *not sparing the flock*, 1 Cor. vii. 28; 2 Pet. ii. 4. etc. 185
6th ed

¹ In the Sept. this verb is found with the Dat. Ex. xvii. 3 *ἐδίψησεν ὁ λαὸς ὕδατι* (for water). Likewise in Ps. lxii. 2 the Cod. Vat. has *ἐδίψησέ σοι* (θεῷ, al. σε) ἡ ψυχὴ μου.

² In Latin *parcere alicui*. But in the Greek *φείδεσθαι*, judging from the construction, lies rather the notion of restraining one's self from, sibi temperare etc. In the Sept., however, this verb also takes the Dative, and is construed with prepositions.

219 On the other hand, we find μέλει also with περί in Matt. xxii. 16; Jno. x. 13; xii. 6, etc. (Her. 6, 101; Xen. C. 4, 5, 17; Hiero, 9, 10, etc.; Wisd. xii. 13; 1 Macc. xiv. 43, cf. Strange in Jahn's Archiv II. 400).

c. Lastly, verbs of *ruling* (Mtth. 838) take the Genitive as the simple case of dependence (for to this the notion of *preceding* also reduces itself, Hartung, S. 14): Mark x. 42 οἱ δοκούντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν (Rom. xv. 12 LXX.), cf. also κυριεύειν Rom. xiv. 9; 2 Cor. i. 24, ἀνθεντεῖν 1 Tim. ii. 12, καταδυναστεύειν Jas. ii. 6, ἀνθυπατεύειν Acts xviii. 12 etc. — verbs all derived from nouns, and whose construction is to be resolved thus: κύριόν τινος εἶναι, ἀνθύπατόν τινος εἶναι. On the other hand, βασιλεύειν τινός 194 (Her. 1, 206 and Sept.) never occurs in the N. T.; but we find ^{194 ed.} instead, conformably to the Heb. idiom (בָּ with verbs of *ruling*, Ps. xlvii. 9; Prov. xxviii. 15; Neh. v. 15) βασ. ἐπὶ τινος Matt. ii. 22; Rev. v. 10, or ἐπὶ τινα Luke i. 33; xix. 14, 27; Rom. v. 14; cf. Lob. Phryn. 475.

Verbs of *buying* and *selling* take the Genitive of the *price* (Bhdy. 177 f. Mdv. 67 f.); as, Matt. x. 29 οὐχὶ δύο στρούθια ἀσσαρίον πωλεῖται — xxvi. 9 ἡδύνατο τοῦτοπραθῆναι πολλοῦ, xx. 13; Mark xiv. 5; Acts v. 8 (Plato apol. 20 b.) 1 Cor. vi. 20; cf. Rev. vi. 6 — Bar. i. 10; iii. 30 (but Matt. xxvii. 7 ἡγόρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν viz. ἀργυρίων, Acts i. 18), Acts vii. 16 ὠνήσατο τιμῆς ἀργυρίου (with ἐκ Palaeph. 46, 3, 4). Also under this head comes Jude 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν for *reward* (Xen. C. 3, 2, 7; Plat. rep. 9, 575 b.). Agreeably to the construction with ἐκ. and still more in view of the fundamental import of the Genitive, this genitivus pretii might be reduced to the notion of *proceeding from* (cf. Eng. *proceeds*), as that which is bought for a price *comes* to us, as it were, *out of* the price given. But it is probably more correct to refer this construction to the Genitive of *exchanging*, and to compare such phraseology as ἀλλάσσειν τί τινος (Hartung, 15; Mtth. 483); for one buys or sells *in exchange for* so much money. Hence in Greek ἀντί [cf. Heb. xii. 2, 16] is the preposition of price. (A different view will be found in Hm. Opusc. I. 179; see on the other hand Prüfer de graeca et lat. declinat. 98 sq.) However, the construction ἀλλάσσειν, διαλλάσσειν τί τινος does not itself occur in the Greek Bible, but in Rom. i. 23 we find the more explicit ἀλλάσσειν τι ἔν τινι, as in the Sept. (after the Heb. אֲחֲלִיפֶה) Ps. cv. 20. Ἀλλάσσειν τί τινι comes nearest to this (Her. 7, 152; Sept. Exod. xiii. 13; Lev. xxvii. 10, and frequently). Moreover, words of *valuing*, *estimating*, etc. stand on the same footing with verbs of *buying*, etc., and govern in like manner the Genitive (Krü. 44); cf. ἀξίως Matt. iii. 8; x. 10; Rom. i. 32, ἀξιῶν 2 Thess. i. 11; 1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. iii. 3, etc.

11. The Genitive of *place* and of *time* is employed without being directly governed by a single word, yet in accordance with the ^{6th ed} primary import of the case (Hm. Vig. 881; Hartung, 32 ff.) and in obvious connection with the structure of the sentence; as, Aesch. Prom. 714 *λαῖας χειρὸς σιδηροτέκτονες οἰκοῦσι Χάλκῳ* *on the left hand* (Her. 5, 77), Xen. Eph. 5, 13 *ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας* *that day*, Philostr. her. 9, 3 f. *χειμῶνος* *in winter*, 'of a winter,' Thuc. 3, 104 (Mtth. 857 f.). The N. T. writers, in this case, almost invariably employ a preposition. Only in certain standing phrases do they use the Genitive alone (which is strictly a partitive Genitive); as, often *νυκτός* *by night*, also *μέσης νυκτός* Matt. xxv. 6, *ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός* Luke xviii. 7; Acts ix. 24 (Xen. A. 2, 6, 7), *χειμῶνος* Matt. xxiv. 20 (joined with *σαββάτῳ*), Luke xxiv. 1 *ὁρθρου βαθείας*, v. 19 *μὴ εὐρόντες, ποίας (ὁδοῦ) εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν* (*by*) *what way*, xix. 4 (*ἐκείνης* sc. *ὁδοῦ*), Gal. vi. 17 *τοῦ λοιποῦ* (Thuc. 4. 98) cf. the German *des weitern*. (But for the very reason that the Genitive of time is confined in the N. T. to simple and current phrases, ^{7th ed} Acts i. 3 *ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα* in D must not be translated *within forty days* (Mtth. 858), see above 2, a. Had such been Luke's meaning, he would undoubtedly have employed a preposition.)

Rev. xvi. 7 *ἤκουσα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος* is certainly not to be referred to this head (*I heard speaking from the altar*, cf. Soph. El. 78; Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 142; Bttm. Philoct. 115; Bhdy. 137); but, in accordance with the analogous expressions in verse 5 and vi. 3, 5, it must be translated *I heard the altar speaking*; see Bengel in loc. This prosopopoeia may be attributed to the strangely mysterious character of these visions, see de Wette. The reading *ἦκ. ἄλλου ἐκ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγ.* is a manifest correction. On *Τιβεριάδος* Jno. vi. 1 see above, p. 191.

Note. Genitives absolute, which often occur in the historical style even in the N. T., are not in their original application properly absolute, but come under the Genitive as the case defining time, cf. Hartung, S. 31 (hence they correspond to Ablatives absolute in Latin). Subsequently, however, they are used in a more extended reference, especially to specify the cause and condition (also involved in the Genitive). We have merely to remark here, that they sometimes occur where the nature of the verb following would lead one to expect a different oblique case: Luke xvii. 12 *εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ . . . ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ*, xxii. 10, 53; xviii. 40 *ἐγγίσαντος αὐτοῦ ἐπερώτησεν αὐτόν*, Mark xi. 27; Acts iv. 1; xxi. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Jno. iv. 51. This is usual likewise in Greek authors, partly because at the beginning of the sentence the writer had not yet decided on the principal verb, and partly because the regular construction would often render the expression clumsy, cf. Her. 1, 41; Thuc. 1, 114;

- 221 3, 13; Xen. A. 2, 4, 24; Mem. 4, 8, 5; Pol. 4, 49, 1; Xen. Eph. 4, 5; Heliod. 2, 30, 113; Wytttenbach, Plut. Mor. II. 21; Schaef. Apollon. Rh. II. 171 and Dem. II. 202; Poppo, Thuc. I. 2, 119; Siebelis, Pausan. II. 8; Hoffmann, Pr. de casib. absol. p. 1.¹ Likewise 2 Cor. iv. 18 αἰώνιον βάρος
 187 δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα might have
 187 ed. been expressed thus: μὴ σκοποῦσι τὰ βλεπ. By the former construction, however, the participial clause is brought out with more prominence and force. Cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 37. Finally, Genitives absolute are exceptionally used when the subject of the principal clause (in the Nominative) is the same as that of the secondary clause; as, Matt. i. 18 μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς, εἰρήθῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα, where the writer probably had contemplated another termination of the sentence. So perhaps Rev. xvii. 8. In Greek authors such instances are rare; yet see Her. 5, 81; Plat. rep. 8, 547 b.; Pol. 31, 17, 1, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 119 sq.; Wannowski, p. 61 sqq. In the Sept. notice Gen. xlv. 4;
 196 Exod. iv. 21; v. 20; xiv. 18; cf. Acta apocr. p. 68, 69; Epiphan. vit. 196 ed. p. 326, 340, 346 (in the 2d vol. of the Works of Epiphan. ed. Colon.); in Latin, Suet. Tib. 31. In all these instances Genitives absolute appear as fixed forms of expression, their grammatical origin being no longer taken into consideration.

§ 31. DATIVE.

In Greek the Dative is the more comprehensive in its import, because it represents the Ablative also, which in Latin is a separate case (cf. Hm. emend. rat. p. 140). Its relation to a sentence is not (in general) close and essential, like that of the Acc. or even the Gen.; but it serves merely to complete and extend, inasmuch as it points out the object (mostly a person) towards which an action tends, to which it has reference, yet on which it does not directly terminate. Hence the Dative frequently accompanies an Acc. of the object; as, 2 Cor. ix. 2 προθυμία ἣν κανχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν, Acts xxii. 25 προέτειναν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἰμάσιν (Kuin. in loc.), xxiv. 5; Jno. vi. 13. In a looser application (to things) the Dative denotes what in any way accompanies the action, as motive, power, circumstance (of time and place), etc.

- 222 1. We shall first consider the Dative as the case of reference (of the more remote object, as it is commonly called) when joined to transitive verbs — as, δίδοναι (δωρεῖσθαι) τί τινι, γράφειν τί τινι (2 Cor. ii. 3), εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τινί τι (Luke ii. 10; 2 Cor. xi. 7),

¹ From the Latin compare Ablat. absol. in Cic. Phil. 11, 10; fam. 15, 4, 18; Caes. b. gall. 5, 4; civ. 1, 36; 2, 19; 3, 21.

ὀφείλειεν τινί τι Matt. xviii. 28 ; Rom. xiii. 8 (cf. Rom. i. 14 ; viii. 12, contrary xv. 27), ὁμοιοῦν τινά τινι Matt. vii. 24 ; xi. 16, καταλίσσειεν τινά τινι 2 Cor. v. 18, ἐγείρειν θλίψιν τοῖς δεσμοῖς Phil. i. 17, all which present no difficulty, — and especially to intransitive verbs and their cognate adjectives.

Its force is more or less distinct,

a. In ἀκολουθεῖν, ἐγγίξεν, κολλᾶσθαι, στοιχεῖν (Rom. iv. 12 etc.), δεδέσθαι (Rom. vii. 2 ; 1 Cor. vii. 27), ἐντυγχάνειν τινί etc., also εὔχεσθαι τινι Acts xxvi. 29.

b. In μεριμνᾶν Matt. vi. 25, ὀργίζεσθαι v. 22, μετριοπαθεῖν τινι Heb. v. 2, in μέμφεσθαι Heb. viii. 8 (Krü. 21), φθονεῖν Gal. v. 26.

c. In πιστεῦναι, πεποιθέναι, ἀπιστεῖν, ἀπειθεῖν, ὑπακούειν, ὑπήκοος, ἐναντίος, etc.

d. In προσκυνεῖν, λατρεύειν (not Phil. iii. 3), δουλοῦν.

e. In ἀρέσκειν, ἀρκεῖν Matt. xxv. 9 ; 2 Cor. xii. 9, ἀρκετός and ἱκανός Matt. vi. 34 ; 1 Pet. iv. 3 ; 2 Cor. ii. 6.

f. Further, in *ξενίζεσθαι τινι* 1 Pet. iv. 12 (Thuc. 4, 85) *be surprised at a thing* (the surprise being in reference to the thing), ^{6th cl.} ἀπολογεῖσθαι (2 Cor. xii. 19 ; Acts xix. 33 cf. 1 Pet. iii. 15) and *διακατελέγεσθαι τινι* (Acts xvii. 2 ; xviii. 19), *διακατελέγεσθαι τινι* Acts xviii. 28 (*δογματίζειν τινί* cf. Col. ii. 20), where the person to whom the conversation, defence, etc. is addressed, is indicated by the Dative. Also ὁμολογεῖν and ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τινι (Jas. v. 16), even in the sense of *praise* (ἡ ἡγή) Luke x. 21 ; Rom. xiv. 11 ; ¹⁹⁷ Heb. xiii. 15, since every act of praise to God is a confession made ^{7th cl.} to him, that we recognize him as the High and Mighty One. So in one instance also αἰνεῖν τινι Rev. xix. 5 according to the best Codd. [Sin. too], cf. Ecclus. li. 12 ; in this case, too, ἡ ἡγή was probably in mind, — unless the construction is *ad sensum* like εἰπεῖν αἰνεσιν.

g. In κρίνεσθαι Matt. v. 40, διακρίνεσθαι τινι Jude 9 (Jer. xv. 10) *to go to law, to contend with one*.

h. In verbs of *likeness* or *similarity* — under another point of view — Matt. xxiii. 27 ὁμοιάζετε τάφοις κεκονισμένοις, vi. 8 ; Heb. ii. 17 ; 2 Cor. x. 12 cf. ὁμοίως, ἴσος τινί Matt. xi. 16 ; Jno. ix. 9 ; 1 Jno. iii. 2 ; Acts xiv. 15 ; Matt. xx. 12 ; Phil. ii. 6 ; cf. Fr. Arist. amic. p. 15 (ὁμοίως also once with the Genitive, Jno. viii. 55 ; Mtth. 873 ; cf. § 30, 4), and verbs of *participating in* ; as, 1 Tim. v. 22 ; 1 Pet. iv. 13 cf. Luke v. 10 ; Rom. xv. 27 (these verbs have more frequently the Gen. § 30, 8). Likewise ὁμιλεῖν τινι Acts xxiv. 26.

i. In verbs of *using*, as χρῆσθαι Acts xxvii. 17 ; 1 Cor. ix. 12, 15 ; ²²³

(on the contrary, once 1 Cor. vii. 31 with the Acc. in the best Codd. [also Sin.*], as sometimes in later writers e.g. Malal. p. 5; Theophan. p. 314; Böckh, corp. inscript. II. 405 — not Xen. Ages. 11, 11 — cf. Bornem. Act. p. 222. But in Acts xxi. 17 the Acc. has little authority).

k. In *στήκειν* (*ἑστηκέναι*) *τινί*, to stand fast for a thing 2 Cor. i. 24; Gal. v. 1 (var.), or a person Rom. xiv. 4.

Προσκυνεῖν (reverence and worship) invariably governs the Dative in Matt. Mark and Paul (Matt. iv. 10 is a quotation from Deut. vi. 13); while in the other N. T. writers it has sometimes the Dat. (Jno. ix. 38; Acts vii. 43; Heb. i. 6; Rev. iv. 10; vii. 11; xiii. 4, etc.), sometimes the Acc. (Luke iv. 8; xxiv. 52; Jno. iv. 23; Rev. ix. 20; xiv. 11); similarly *γονυπετεῖν* τινα Mark (i. 40) x. 17; Matt. xvii. 14 (and *λατρεῖν* *τινά* sometimes, Mtth. 886). The Dative after *προσκυνεῖν* is peculiar to later Greek alone; Lob. Phryn. p. 463; cf. Bos, ex. phil. p. 1 sqq.; Kypke, obs. I. 7 sq.

Χαίρειν, which in Greek authors is often construed with the Dative (Fr. Rom. III. 78 f.), and sometimes also in the Sept. (Prov. xvii. 19, cf. Bar. iv. 37), is never so used in the N. T. (on Rom. xii. 12 see below, No. 7; in 1 Cor. xiii. 6 the Dat. depends on *σύν*) but for the most part with *ἐπί* over.

The phrases *ἀποθανεῖν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*, *τῷ νόμῳ* Rom. vi. 2; Gal. ii. 19, *θαυατοῦσθαι τῷ νόμῳ* Rom. vii. 4, *νεκρὸν εἶναι τῇ ἁμ.* vi. 11, in antithesis to *ζῆν τι* (*τῷ θεῷ* Rom. vi. 10 cf. 1 Pet. iv. 10) signify: to be dead to (for) sin, the law etc. cf. Rom. vii. 4 *εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ* and *ἀπογενέσθαι τῇ ἁμαρτ.* 1 Pet. ii. 24. In the same way, in Rom. vi. 20 *ἐλεύθεροι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ* is contrasted with *δουλοῦσθαι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ* (verse 18 cf. 19, 20): when ye were slaves to sin, ye were free to (relatively to) righteousness, — so far as righteousness is concerned, freemen.

189 In *κατακρίνειν* *τινὰ θανάτῳ* Matt. xx. 18 (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 6),¹ an expression
6th ed. unknown to classic Greek, we find a Dative of the thing after a verb of
198 sentencing: to condemn one to death, i.e. by sentence adjudge to death.
7th ed. The classical Greek construction is *κατακρίνειν* *τινὰ θανάτου* or *θάνατον*
(Mtth. 850; Heupel, Mr. 285), or *κατακρ. τινὶ θάνατον* Her. 6, 85 (to award death). Analogous is *καταδικάζειν* *τινὰ θανάτῳ*, Lob. Phryn. p. 475; cf. also *ἑνοχος τῇ κρίσει* Matt. v. 21 f. *amenable to the court* (§ 30, 8). Cf. Bleek, Heb. II. I. 340.

2. Closely connected with this is the Dative dependent on *εἶναι* (*ὑπάρχειν*) and *γίνεσθαι* (not on the predicates joined to them); 224 for *ἐστὶ* or *γίνεται μοι φόβος* can only mean: the *φόβον εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι* applies, refers, to me. From it result the following uses:

¹ This construction is unknown also in the O. T. Of the parallel passages quoted by Bretsch. one, Sus. 41, is *κατέκριναν αὐτὴν ἀποθανεῖν*, and the other, vs. 48, is absol. *κατεκρίνατε θυγατέρα Ἰσραὴλ*.

a. Without a predicate, *εἶναι τι* expresses property (possession), *γίνεσθαι τι* impartation: Luke ii. 7 οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος *they had no room*, Acts viii. 21; x. 6; iii. 6; xxi. 23; Matt. xviii. 12; Luke i. 14 ἔσται χαρά σοι, Matt. xvi. 22 οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο *this will not befall thee*, Acts xx. 3, 16; ii. 43 ἐγένετο πάση ψυχῇ φόβος *fear fell upon*, Rom. xi. 25. Elliptically 1 Cor. vi. 13; v. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Jno. ii. 4 (Krü. 59).

b. With a predicate (mostly a substantive), *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι τι* denotes what quality *for a person* a thing has or receives, objectively as well as subjectively (i.e. in his own opinion); as, 1 Cor. viii. 9 μήπως ἡ ἐξουσία . . . πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν, i. 18 ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστίν etc. ix. 2; xiv. 22; Rom. ii. 14; vii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 3; ix. 3; Phil. i. 28. But *become* (redound) *to* (Krü. 59) is usually expressed in the N. T. by *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι εἰς τι*.

3. *Substantives* derived from verbs governing a Dative sometimes take the same case, instead of the ordinary Genitive; as, 2 Cor. ix. 12 εὐχαρισταί τῷ θεῷ (not 11), somewhat like εὐχαὶ τοῖς θεοῖς Plat. legg. 7, 800 a., see Wytttenbach, Plut. Mor. I. 154 Lips.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. 101, and rep. I. 372; Ast, Plat. Polit. 451; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. 374; Fr. Mr. p. 63. Compare besides τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ Luke iv. 16; Acts xvii. 2 (Plat. legg. 658 c. τὸ ἦθος ἡμῖν) and τὸ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ 1 Cor. vii. 35. The case is different in Luke vii. 12 υἱὸς μονογενὴς τῇ μητρὶ *a son who was to his mother an only son* (thus not strictly for the Genitive, cf. Tob. iii. 15 μονογενὴς τῷ πατρὶ, Judg. xi. 34), with which the Dative of relationship—cf. Luke v. 10; Rom. iv. 12 (Bttm. Philoct. p. 102 sq.; Boisson. Nic. p. 271; Ast, Plat. Polit. 451, 519, also legg. p. 9)—is not to be confounded. On Rom. iv. 12 see § 61, 5, p. 555.

Also in Matt. xxvii. 7 ἡγόρασαν τὸν ἀγρὸν . . . εἰς ταφὴν τοῖς ξένοις *for a burying-ground for strangers*, the Dative belongs to the substantive; cf. Strabo 17, 807 πρὸς ἐπιδείξιν τοῖς ξένοις. See Schoem. Isae. p. 264; 199 Krü. 68 f. But in 1 Cor. vii. 28 the Dative may be referred to the verb of the sentence. Yet see Bhdy. S. 88.

4. The Dative, without being directly involved in the signification of a verb or noun, expresses the relation of the action to some one: 2 Cor. ii. 12 οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἀνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου *for my spirit* (1 Cor. vii. 28), or Luke xviii. 31 πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα . . . τῷ νῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου *which were written for him* (that they might receive fulfilment in him), (Matt. xiii. 14; Jude 14). Cf. besides, Matt. xiii. 52; Phil. i. 27; 1 Tim. i. 9; Rev. xxi. 2. Especially deserving of notice are,

a. The Dative of *opinion* or *decision* (cf. above, No. 2); as, Plato, Phaed. 101 d. εἰ σοι ἀλλήλοις ξυμφωνεῖ ἢ διαφωνεῖ; Soph. Oed. C. 1446. So in the expressions Acts vii. 20 ἀστείως τῷ θεῷ, 2 Cor. x. 4 δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ.¹ See also 1 Cor. ix. 2. Cf. Wyttenb. Plat. Phaed. as above; Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 615; Krü. 61.

b. The Dative of *interest*, 2 Cor. v. 13 εἶτε ἐξέστημεν, θεῷ· εἶτε σωφρονούμεν, ὑμῖν (Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 22), or, more definitely, the *dativus commodi* and *incommodi*, Jno. iii. 26 ὃ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, *to whom*, in favor of whom (Luke iv. 22; Rom. x. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; cf. Xen. M. 1, 2, 21). On the other hand, Matt. xxiii. 31 μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστέ etc., *against* yourselves, cf. Jas. v. 3. Cf. besides, Heb. vi. 6; Jude 1; Rom. xiii. 2. On Rev. viii. 3, see Ewald. (But Eph. v. 19 λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς — ἀλλήλοις — ψαλμοῖς, etc., is a simple Dative of direction: *speaking to one another*, etc.)

5. The preceding illustrations suffice to show that the Dative is as closely related to the prepositions εἰς (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 360)² and πρὸς (cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 558), as the Gen. is to the prepositions ἐκ and ἀπο. Hence in many phrases one of the former prepositions is used instead of the Dative. Thus we find, as every one knows, not only λέγειν τινί and πρὸς τινα (the latter is in Matt. and Mark the usual indeed almost invariable expression, see Schulz, Parab. v. Verwalt. S. 38) — cf. κράζειν τινί Rev. vii. 2; xiv. 15, φωνεῖν τινι Rev. xiv. 18, — but also εὔχεσθαι θεῷ Acts xxvi. 29 (Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 12; Demosth. Conon. 729 c.; Plut. Coriol. 9; Xen. Eph. 4, 3), and εὔχεσθαι πρὸς θεόν 2 Cor. xiii. 7 (Xen. M. 1, 3, 2) cf. Phil. iv. 6, βοᾶν τινι Luke xviii. 7 and β. πρὸς τινα Hos. vii. 14, ψεύδεσθαι τινι (Acts v. 4; Ps. xvii. 45; lxxvii. 36; Jer. v. 12, but not in Greek authors) and ψεύδ. πρὸς τινα (*to lie against one, to be false towards one*) Xen. A. 1, 3, 5, καταλλάττειν τινί and πρὸς τινα Xen. vectig. 6, 8; Joseph. antt. 14, 11, 3³ εὐδοκεῖν εἰς τινα 2 Pet. i. 17 and τινί in Greek writers (Pol. 4, 22, 7; 1 Macc. i. 43), μάχεσθαι τινι Xen. A. 4, 5, 12; Plato, rep. 3, 407 a. and πρὸς τινα Jno. vi. 52; Iliad. 17, 98; Plato, Lach. 191 d.; Lucian. conv. 42, and often (also in Sept.),⁴ ὀμιλεῖν τινι and πρὸς τινα Luke xxiv. 14;

¹ Τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ, as Lchm. and Tdf. read Jas. ii. 5, would be similar.

² In modern Greek the Acc. with εἰς serves very commonly as a circumlocution for the Dative, even in its simplest relations; as, λέγω εἰς τὸν φίλον μου dico amico meo, (German, gegen m. Fr.), see v. Lüdemann, Lehrb. 90.

³ Col. i. 20 ἀποκαταλλ. εἰς would be analogous, if this were not designedly a pregnant construction; see Mey.

⁴ So besides παραβάλλειν τί τινι (Her. 4. 198) also τι πρὸς τι occurs (Joseph. Ap. 2. 15). Otherwise Mark iv. 30 ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλλωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, see Fr.; but the reading here varies.

Xen. M. 4, 3, 2. The construction with a preposition doubtless ¹⁹¹ attracted the N. T. writers, through the influence of the explicit ^{6th ed.} and graphic idiom of their vernacular tongue, and hence where the Dat. commodi or incommodi would have been sufficient for native Greek authors, we find *εἰς*: Acts xxiv. 17 *ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου*, Luke vii. 30 *τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς to their own harm* (so that *εἰς* also signifies *contra*).¹ On the other hand *κηρύττειν* or *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι εἰς*, being constantly followed by the Plural of the noun, denotes *to make known among*, Mark xiii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 25; Luke xxiv. 47 (Paus. 8, 5, 8). In Matt. xx. 1 *μισθοῦσθαι εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα* means hire, not *for*, but *into* his vineyard. In the same way, the construction is pregnant in Mark viii. 19 *τοὺς ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς τοὺς πεντακισχίλ. broke* (and divided) *among* the etc. Likewise in Matt. v. 22 *ἐνόχος εἰς τὴν γέενναν liable into Gehenna*, i.e. to go, be cast (on the other hand *τῇ κρίσει, τῷ συνεδρίῳ*). Also Rom. viii. 18 *τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς* is an abridged expression (see Fr.) similar to the Hebrew *לְפָנַי* 1 Sam. iii. 7. Lastly, in the phrases *ὠφέλιμος πρὸς τι* 1 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Tim. iii. 16 (with *εἰς* Xen. Oec. 5, 11 cf. *χρήσιμος εἰς* Wisd. xiii. 11), *εὐθετος εἰς τι* Luke xiv. 35 (Dion. H. de Thuc. 55, 3, with *πρὸς* Pol. 26, 5, 6; D. S. 5, 37) the preposition with the Acc. must not be regarded as put for the Dative, since *useful, adapted, for, to something* is quite an appropriate expression, while the Dative would be more suitable in reference to the Person. Yet cf. Luke ix. 62 var.

The phrase *πιστεύειν εἰς* or *ἐπὶ τινα* (Acts ix. 42; xxii. 19) obviously means in Christian phraseology more than *πιστεύειν τινί* (*credere, confidere alicui*), and is to be taken as pregnant: in faith to resign one's self *unto* any one, to profess one's self a believer *on* one, *fide se ad aliquem applicare*.² Likewise *παράδιδόναι εἰς* (to deliver up *to* any one) is not simply equivalent ²²⁷ to *παρ. τινί*, but rather denotes deliver into the power of, surrender to, Matt. 201 x. 17; hence it is used with *θάνατος* Matt. x. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 11, *θλάψας* Matt. ^{7th ed.} xxiv. 9, *ἀκαθαρσία* Rom. i. 24 etc.; cf. Xen. Hel. 1, 7, 8. The construction *ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσέλγείᾳ εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης* etc. Eph. iv. 19 requires no explanation.

¹ In Luke viii. 43 the text. rec. has *εἰς ἱατροὺς προσαναλῶσασα δλον τὸν βλον*, but the best Codd. [Sin. too] have *ἱατροῖς*. The latter must be preferred, as the former appears to be a correction. In Greek authors, that is to say, the verb is usually construed with *εἰς*, Xen. Cyrop. 2, 4, 9; Aelian. 14, 32.

² *Πιστεύειν ἐν Χριστῷ* is to be understood in the same way, yet this expression cannot be unquestionably established from Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 13; we find, however, in Mark i. 15 *πιστ. ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*, which is not essentially different. Further, *ἡ πρὸς τινα πίστις*, and the like (Schwarz, Comment. p. 1102), do not prove the expression *πιστεύειν πρὸς* or *εἰς τινα* to be pure Greek.

Note. The Dat. is related also to *μετά*. Accordingly, in the N. T. we find *πολεμεῖν μετά τινος* Rev. xii. 7; xiii. 4 for *πολεμεῖν τινι*, also *κρίνεσθαι μετά τινος* 1 Cor. vi. 6 (7). In other relations a circumlocution for the Dat. is formed, a. By means of *ἐνώπιον* Acts vi. 5 *ἤρεσεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους* 192 *ἐνώπιον* (Gen. xxxiv. 18; xli. 37; 2 Sam. iii. 36, etc.) cf. 1 Jno. iii. 22, *προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ* (Luke iv. 7; Rev. xv. 4). This, like almost all constructions with *ἐνώπιον* (עֲנִי), is Hebraistic. b. After *πέποιθα* by *ἐν* Phil. iii. 3, or *ἐπί* with Dat. Mark x. 24; 2 Cor. i. 9 and with Acc. Matt. xxvii. 43 (1 Macc. x. 77), [or lastly by *εἰς*, yet only in Gal. v. 10]. c. After *ἀκολουθεῖν* by *ὀπίσω* Matt. x. 38; see § 33.

That the Dative can be employed precisely for the local *πρός* or *εἰς* with the Acc. has been denied by Bornem. (in Rosenm. Repertor. II. 253 and in the neu. krit. Journ. d. theol. Literat. VI. 146 f., cf. also ad Anab. p. 23), and also by Mey. on Acts ii. 33. It is true, the examples adduced from Greek poets by Fr. (Conject. I. 42) do not establish the rule (for prose), and the N. T. passages may be explained differently: in Acts ii. 33 and v. 31 *ἔψαλόν τῇ δεξιᾷ* may signify *by (his) right hand*; in Rev. ii. 16 *σοι* is simply a Dat. incommodi; even Acts xxi. 16 might be rendered (after Beza and Glass.) *adducetes secum, apud quem hospitaremur Mnasonem*, so that *Μνάσωνι* dependent on *ἄγοντες* as Acc. of the object (*Μνάσωνα κ.τ.λ.*) would be incorporated into the relative clause. But the latter rendering has little probability.¹ Sooner could we, according to Bornem.'s more recent suggestion (Luke p. 177 sq.), resolve the attraction in the above passage thus: *ἄγοντες (ἡμᾶς)* 228 *παρὰ Μνάσωνά τινα . . . παρ' ᾧ ξενοσθῶμεν* (as to *ἄγειν παρὰ τινα* cf. Her. 1, 86; 3, 15); even this, however, is not the easiest way. The construction *ἄγειν τινί* *bring to one* may indeed be unusual (yet see the Note) in Attic prose, but in later prose authors we find expressions entirely similar, as *φοιτᾶν τινι* Philostr. Soph. 2, 1, 14 (Wytttenbach, Plutarch. Mor. IV. 339), *ἤκειν τινί* Plutarch. 202 Aem. 16, 1, *εἰσφέρειν τινά τινι* Malal. 10, p. 231. On Acts xxi. 16 7th ed. especially, however, cf. Xen. Eph. 3, 6, p. 63 *πότερον ἡγόμην Ἀβρο-*

¹ Not precisely on account of the annexed predicate *ἀρχ. μαθητῇ* (Bengel's n. Archiv III. 175), as that refers to Mnason to show that Paul could trust him perfectly; but rather because it is not credible that his companions would have brought a host for Paul with them from Caesarea, as there were in Jerusalem so many trustworthy Christians. According to this view one would have to assume that this Mnason was either accidentally present in Caesarea, or that he had a residence in two places at the same time. By dropping *secum*, which is not implied in *ἄγοντες*, the statement would become simpler: they brought (introduced) Mnason in Jerusalem after their arrival; but then the position of the words would not be suitable.

κόμη, and Epiph. vit. p. 340 d. ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν Ἀθανασίῳ τῷ πάππῃ.¹ See also Bhdy. 95; Held, Plut. Aem. P. p. 200. Hence ὑψοῦν τῇ δεξιᾷ may without hesitation be translated: *raise to the right hand*; cf. vs. 34 (of Acts ii.) κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου; cf. Lucian. asin. 39.

In Luke ii. 41 ἐπορεύοντο ... εἰς Ἱερ. τῇ ἑορτῇ is not *to the festival* 193 (Luth. *auf das Osterfest*), but either *on account of the f.* (see below, 6 c.), ^{6th ed.} or, as a loose expression, *at the f.* (as we also say: they made a yearly journey *at Easter* to ... to attend divine service). There would be more reason for referring to the preceding rule Mark xiv. 53 συνέρχονται αὐτῷ *convenerant eum*, and Jno. xi. 33 τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰουδαίους (Fr. Mr. 648). Still, as appears to me, in both these passages the Dative is really governed by σύν: the second signifying simply, who had come *with her*; and the first, *they came with him*, that is, with Jesus (verse 54), see BCrus.

Further, different from the foregoing construction is that of the Dative joined to verbs of *coming* in an ideal sense; as, Acts xxi. 31 ἀνέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ compare our *tidings came to him*. A similar usage occurs frequently and indisputably in Greek authors; as, Plutarch. Brut. 27 μέλλοντι αὐτῷ διαβαίνειν ... ἦκεν ἀγγελία περὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς, and Pomp. 13 τῷ Σύλλᾳ πρώτη μὲν ἦλθεν ἀγγελία. Cf. ἀνάγειν τί τινι to bring a thing before one (notify to), Malal. 3 p. 63; 10 p. 254.

6. In a wider use the Dative of the thing is employed of every thing *in reference to which* an action or a state comes to pass. Accordingly, it is used

a. To designate the sphere to which a general predicate is to be conceived as confined (cf. Bhdy. 84; Krü. 74); as, 1 Cor. xiv. 20 μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε children *in understanding*, children *in reference to malice* (Plat. Alcib. pr. 122 c.), Rom. iv. 20 ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει *he grew strong in faith*, 229 Phil. ii. 8 σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, iii. 5; Matt. v. [3] 8; xi. 29; Acts vii. 51; xiv. 8; xvi. 5; xviii. 2; xx. 22; Rev. iv. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 34; Heb. v. 11; xi. 12; xii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18; v. 9 (Pol. 20, 4, 7); Gal. i. 22; Rom. xii. 10 f.; Col. ii. 5; Eph. iv. 18, 23 (Mtth. 898; Fr. Rom. III. 68). Such a Dat. is intercalated in Eph. ii. 3 ἡμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς as respects nature, naturally, children of wrath.

b. Of the rule, or standard, *according to which* something takes place; as, Acts xv. 1 εἰὰν μὴ περιτέμνησθε τῷ ἔθει Μαυροῦς (on the other hand, xvii. 2 κατὰ τὸ εἶωθός, and more frequently κατὰ

¹ Yet ἔγειν τινί (cf. προσάγειν τινί § 52, 4, 14.) is not in all these cases used in a purely local or material sense; but rather means *introduce to one's acquaintance*. Similarly φοιτᾶν τινι (to attend one as teacher), different from φοιτᾶν πρὸς τ. Epict. ench. 33, 13.

ἔθος) cf. Xen. C. 1, 2, 4; Sext. Emp. 2, 6; Strabo 15, 715 (Tob. iii. 8; 2 Macc. vi. 1).

c. Of the occasion or cause (*on account of*); as, Rom. xi. 20 τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν *because of unbelief* (cf. 30 ἡλεήθητε τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ), Gal. vi. 12; Col. i. 21—also of the motive (*through, from, etc.*) 1 Cor. viii. 7 τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσι, 2 Cor. i. 15; Rom. iv. 20. See Diog. L. 2, 57; Heliod. 1, 12, 33; Paus. 3, 7, 3; Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 1; cf. Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 392; Goeller, Thuc. p. 157, 184, etc.; Mtth. 894 f.; Bhdy. 102 f.; Krü. 73.

The use of the Dative in Rev. viii. 4 ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς τῶν θυμιαμάτων ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων, etc. is more strange, and has given rise to numerous conjectures. The simplest translation probably is: *there went up the smoke of the incense (of the angels) for the prayers*, i.e. the ascending smoke availed for the prayers, to attend and render them more acceptable (on the representation see Ewald in loc.). Expositors who supplied 194 6th ed. σύν took the same view of the expression. On the other hand the rendering *inter preces sanctorum* is by no means justifiable. In 2 Cor. vii. 7 the Dat. τῷ πράγματι is certainly allowable, yet harsh for the language of the N.T.; ἐν τῷ πράγματι has good authorities in its favor, and the ἐν was probably omitted, either because it was absorbed by the εἶναι or because ἐν παντί ... was taken with πράγματι.

7. In the uses adduced under 6. the Dative of *direction*, and consequently (according to Greek views) the Dative proper, is still to be detected more or less clearly; but this case, by a further outward extension of its import to whatever accompanies the action, passes over altogether into the Ablative,

d. When it designates the *mode* and *manner*, as casus modalis (Bhdy. 100 f.), 1 Cor. xi. 5 προσευχομένη ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ *with the head uncovered*, x. 30; Col. ii. 11; Phil. i. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 4 (Jude 6), also Rom. viii. 24 τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν (and Eph. v. 19);—or the *instrument* (casus instrumentalis Mdv. 45, yet cf. Krü. 72), as 1 Pet. i. 18 οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε, Gal. ii. 13 ὥστε . . . συναπῆχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει (2 Pet. iii. 17 cf. Zosim. 5, 6), Eph. i. 13; Col. ii. 7; Phil. iii. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 7 τίς στρατεύεται 230 ἰδίοις ὀψωνίοις ποτέ *with his own resources*, at his own expense, Heb. vi. 17 ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ, i. 3; Rom. xv. 18,—likewise Acts i. 5 ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι (xi. 16), Jno. xxi. 8 τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον, Mark vi. 32 (though elsewhere we find ἐν πλοίῳ, Matt. xiv. 13; Acts xxviii. 11; D. S. 19, 54), Acts xii. 2; Rom. i. 20; iii. 24; Tit. iii. 7; Eph. v. 19, etc. To this head may also be referred Heb. xii. 18 ὁρος κεκαυ-

μένον πυρὶ igni ardens, *burning in*, with, *fire*, (Exod. iii. 2 ; Deut. iv. 11 ; ix. 15 ; cf. Lob. Paralip. p. 523 sq.). In Rom. xii. 12 τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες is *through* (in) *hope* rejoicing. In reference to δεήσει in 2 Cor. ix. 14 I now agree with Mey. We often find ἐν or διὰ (especially of persons) used for the instrumental Dative ; as, Rom. xv. 18 ; 2 Cor. xi. 23, 26 f.

A virtual Ablative will be perceived also in μεθύσκεσθαι οἶνον Eph. v. 18 (Prov. iv. 17), and in πληροῦσθαι τινι Rom. i. 29 ; 2 Cor. vii. 4 (Eurip. 204 Herc. fur. 372, cf. πλήρης τινί Eurip. Bacch. 18—oftener with the Gen.—^{7th ed.} Bhdv. 168, in later writers πλησθέντες ἀγνοία Malal. p. 54). (But in Eph. iii. 19 εἰς with the Acc. is not used for the Ablative. The preposition expresses rather : *filled up to the fulness*, etc.)

8. In all these (6 a. et seq.) relations, however, prepositions are not rarely and sometimes even more usually employed,—both in Greek prose, and still more in N. T. Greek,—with or without a modification of the meaning ; viz.

For a. ἐν, 1 Pet. iv. 1 ἐν σαρκὶ παθόν in connection with σαρκὶ παθ., Tit. i. 13 cf. ii. 2 ; διαφέρειν ἐν τινι 1 Cor. xv. 41 (Soph. Oed. C. 1112 ; Dion. H. ep. p. 225. Krü.).

For b. κατά, as almost always κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, εἰωθός Luke iv. 16 ; Acts xvii. 2.

For c. διὰ with the Acc. see § 49 c. p. 398 sq.

For d. διὰ or ἐν also μετά. Thus we find instead of βαπτίζεσθαι ὕδατι usually ἐν ὕδατι (in water) Matt. iii. 11 ; Jno. i. 26, 31 (but also ἐν πνεύματι), for βίᾳ always μετὰ βίας Acts v. 26 ; xxiv. 7 ; for πίστει also διὰ πίστεως, etc. But in Eph. ii. 8 τῇ χάριτι ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως and Rom. iii. 24 the Dat. expresses the motive, διὰ πίστ. the subjective means ; and in 2 Pet. iii. 5 διὰ refers to the material means, the Dat. to the immaterial. For παντὶ τρόπῳ Phil. i. 18 we find ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ 2 Thess. iii. 16. On the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 3 the Dat. is used of the means, and ἐν denotes the state (the disposition).

When, however, N. T. expositors took ἐν simply for a nota dativi (cf. 195 Blomfield, Aeschyl. Agam. 1425, and Eurip. Med. p. 628), even where a ^{8th ed.} Dative proper (not an Ablative) is required, they went too far, and their opinion could not find even a remote support in the Hebrew idiom. Most 231 of the passages quoted are plausible only because in such connection elsewhere the Dative of a person is commonly employed (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 11 ; iii. 1 ; i. 18), but in reality they are quite irrelevant. In Acts iv. 12 δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις is most certainly : *given* (promulged) *among* men,

cf. 2 Cor. viii. 1; ¹ Gal. i. 16 ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί *to reveal his son in me* (ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου); 1 Jno. iv. 9 ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, the love of God was manifested *in* (respect to, *on*) *us* which differs unquestionably from *to us*; 1 Cor. xiv. 11 ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ βάρβαρος *according to me, in my estimation* (meo iudicio, cf. Jacobs, Athen. p. 183; Döderlein, Oed. Col. p. 529; Wex, Soph. Antig. v. 549); 1 Cor. ii. 6 σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις means: *among or with, before, (coram see Plat. symp. 175 e., frequently in the orators § 48 a.) them that are perfect, etc.* (i.e. when we have to deal with such) cf. Judith vi. 2. Baumgarten has in the main correctly explained 2 Cor. iv. 3 ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκα-
 205 λυμένοι: *is hid in (among, with) them that perish.* On ὁμολογεῖν ἔν τινι
 7th ed. see § 32, 3 b. Acts xiii. 15 and Col. ii. 13 require no explanation, and Eph. ii. 5 νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι is not grammatically parallel to the last passage. In Eph. i. 20 ἐνήργησεν ἐν Χριστῷ is quite regular: (*power*) *which he exhibited in Christ* (by raising him from the dead). Matt. xvii. 12 ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν (Mark ix. 13 ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ) is: *they did, perpetrated on him*, cf. Mark xiv. 6; Jno. xiv. 30; Luke xxiii. 31; 1 Cor. ix. 15 (Gen. xl. 14; Judith vii. 24). Likewise correct is the expression 2 Cor. x. 12 μετρεῖν ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς: *measuring themselves on (with) themselves*, though in Greek authors the Dative alone is in use, Aristot. rhet. 2, 12; Herod. 1, 6, 2.

9. *Time*, as that substratum with which all events are connected, is expressed by the Dative in answer to the question *When*; whether it denotes,

a. A space of time; as, Luke viii. 29 πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν *within (during) a long time*, Acts viii. 11; xiii. 20; Rom. xvi. 25; Jno. ii. 20 (not Eph. iii. 5); cf. Joseph. antt. 1, 3, 5 τὸ ὕδωρ ἡμέραις τεσσαράκοντα ὅλαις κατεφέρετο, Soph. Trach. 599 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, Aeschin. ep. 1. p. 121 c.; Diod. S. 19, 93.

b. Or (more frequently) a point of time, *at* which something takes place;—and that, too, in words that directly signify the notion of time or a division of time (with a numeral or Genitive annexed,
 196 Krü. 57), as Luke xii. 20 ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί, Mark vi. 21 Ἑρῳδῆς τοῖς
 6th ed. γενεαῖς αὐτοῦ δεῖπνον ἐποίησε, Matt. [xiv. 6 γενεαῖς γενομένοις according to Lachmann's reading, sustained also by Cod. Sinait.]
 xx. 19 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσεται, xxvi. 17; Luke xiii. 16; Acts
 232 vii. 8; xii. 21; xxi. 26; xxii. 13; xxvii. 23, or in names of festivals (Wannowski, p. 86) Luke xiii. 14 τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσε (xiv. 1), Matt. xii. 1 τοῖς σάββασιν etc. Cf. Plat. conv. 174 a.; Mdv. 48.

¹ So also in Diog. L. 1, 105 τί ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθόν τε καὶ φαῖλον, where, too, the Latin translator has: *quidnam esset hominibus bonum etc.* Cf. besides, Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 628 δουλεύουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτῶν, Arrian. Epict. 1, 18, 8.

Yet *ἐν* is inserted, regularly in the last case, and frequently also in the first (especially with *ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* or *ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως*), even in Luke (iii. 1; i. 26), cf. Krü. 57; the expression *τῇ ἑορτῇ* or *ταῖς ἑορταῖς* without *ἐν* is rare even in Greek authors (Wannowski, 88).

The Dative of *place* is not deeply rooted in the N. T. Before names of cities *ἐν* is always put; as, *ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐν Τύρῳ* Acts xvii. 6; xix. 1; Rom. i. 7; 2 Tim. i. 17; iv. 20, etc. But *ὁδός* occasionally dispenses with the preposition; as, Jas. ii. 25 *ἐτέρᾳ ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα* (where, however, the prepos. was hardly necessary) cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 16, *ὁδῷ πορεύεσθαι* 2 Pet. ii. 15; Acts xiv. 16 (trop.) cf. Lucian. Tim. 5 *ὁδῷ βαδίζειν* (Fr. Rom. III. 140 sq.), *στοιχεῖν τοῖς ἰχνεσι* Rom. iv. 12 (*βαίνειν ἰχνεσι* Plut. Sol. 30), with which are to be classed also the figurative expressions *πορ. τῷ φόβῳ* Acts ix. 31; xiv. 16; Prov. xxviii. 26; 2 Sam. xv. 11; 1 Macc. vi. 23; Bar. i. 18; ii. 10; iv. 13; Tob. i. 2; iv. 5 (interchangeably with *πορ. ἐν* 1 Pet. iv. 3, etc.) and even *περιπατεῖν τοῖς ἔθεσι* Acts xxi. 21; 2 Cor. xii. 18, Gal. v. 16; Rom. xiii. 13. Generally, even in Greek prose, the use of the Dativus localis is very limited; see Mdv. 48; Poppo, Thuc. 1, 143. 206
7th ed.

10. The Dative (of a person) with Passives instead of *ὑπό, παρά*, etc. with the Gen., is but seldom employed (and then usually with the Perfect): Luke xxiii. 15 *οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶ πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ* (Isocr. paneg. c. 18). Yet this construction is not entirely the same as that with *ὑπό* etc.; it denotes the person not by whom something has been done, but to whom what has been done belongs (Mdv. 45; Krü. 72; Benseler, Isocr. Evag. p. 13). It is used in particular with *εὐρίσκεσθαι* 2 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 14; Rom. x. 20 Sept.; cf. besides Luke xxiv. 35 (Jas. iii. 18) Phil. iv. 5 (Acts xxiv. 14), also 2 Pet. ii. 19 where *ὃ τις ἡττηται* means, *by what a man is overcome*, to what he is inferior, (in classic Greek *ἡττᾶσθαι τινας*). But in Acts xvi. 9 *ὥφθη ὄραμα τῷ Παύλῳ* means *became visible to him* (as often elsewhere *ὀφθῆναι τινι appear to one*). In Jas. iii. 7 *τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ* means rather *by the nature of man* (*ingeniis hominum*). In general, the Dative of a thing with Passives (probably also in Rom. xii. 16, see Fr. in loc.) is less surprising, as it coincides with the Dative of the means. In Heb. iv. 2 *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* indicates probably the persons *with* or *in* whom the *μὴ συγκρ. τῇ πίστει* occurred. Lastly, Matt. v. 21 ff. *ἐβρόθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις* should be translated: *to them* of old time; see Tholuck, Bergpr. 158 f. The above use of the Dative (of a pers.) after Passives is known likewise in Greek prose, but it is especially frequent after participles; cf. Dem. Olynth. 3, p. 12 c.; 233

(on the contrary, once 1 Cor. vii. 31 with the Acc. in the best Codd. [also Sin.*], as sometimes in later writers e.g. Malal. p. 5; Theophan. p. 314; Böckh, corp. inscript. II. 405 — not Xen. Ages. 11, 11 — cf. Bornem. Act. p. 222. But in Acts xxvii. 17 the Acc. has little authority).

k. In *στήκειν* (*ἑστηκέναι*) *τινί*, to stand fast for a thing 2 Cor. i. 24; Gal. v. 1 (var.), or a person Rom. xiv. 4.

Προσκυνεῖν (*reverence* and *worship*) invariably governs the Dative in Matt. Mark and Paul (Matt. iv. 10 is a quotation from Deut. vi. 13); while in the other N. T. writers it has sometimes the Dat. (Jno. ix. 38; Acts vii. 43; Heb. i. 6; Rev. iv. 10; vii. 11; xiii. 4, etc.), sometimes the Acc. (Luke iv. 8; xxiv. 52; Jno. iv. 23; Rev. ix. 20; xiv. 11); similarly *γονυπετεῖν* *τινα* Mark (i. 40) x. 17; Matt. xvii. 14 (and *λατρεῖν* *τινά* sometimes, Mth. 886). The Dative after *προσκυνεῖν* is peculiar to later Greek alone; Lob. Phryn. p. 463; cf. Bos, ex. phil. p. 1 sqq.; Kypke, obs. I. 7 sq.

Χαίρειν, which in Greek authors is often construed with the Dative (Fr. Rom. III. 78 f.), and sometimes also in the Sept. (Prov. xvii. 19, cf. Bar. iv. 37), is never so used in the N. T. (on Rom. xii. 12 see below, No. 7; in 1 Cor. xiii. 6 the Dat. depends on *σύν*) but for the most part with *ἐπί* over.

The phrases *ἀποθανεῖν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*, *τῷ νόμῳ* Rom. vi. 2; Gal. ii. 19, *θανатоῦσθαι τῷ νόμῳ* Rom. vii. 4, *νεκρὸν εἶναι τῇ ἁμ.* vi. 11, in antithesis to *ζῆν τι* (*τῷ θεῷ* Rom. vi. 10 cf. 1 Pet. iv. 10) signify: to be dead to (for) sin, the law etc. cf. Rom. vii. 4 *εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ* and *ἀπογενέσθαι τῇ ἁμαρτ.* 1 Pet. ii. 24. In the same way, in Rom. vi. 20 *ἐλεύθεροι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ* is contrasted with *δουλοῦσθαι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ* (verse 18 cf. 19, 20): when ye were slaves to sin, ye were free to (relatively to) righteousness, — so far as righteousness is concerned, freemen.

189 In *κατακρίνειν* *τινὰ θανάτῳ* Matt. xx. 18 (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 6),¹ an expression
6th ed. unknown to classic Greek, we find a Dative of the thing after a verb of
198 sentencing: to condemn one to death, i.e. by sentence adjudge to death.
7th ed. The classical Greek construction is *κατακρίνειν* *τινὰ θανάτου* or *θάνατον*
(Mth. 850; Heupel, Mr. 285), or *κατακρ.* *τινὶ θάνατον* Her. 6, 85 (to award death). Analogous is *καταδικάζειν* *τινὰ θανάτῳ*, Lob. Phryn. p. 475; cf. also *ἑνὸς τῇ κρίσει* Matt. v. 21 f. *amenable to the court* (§ 30, 8). Cf. Bleek, Heb. II. I. 340.

2. Closely connected with this is the Dative dependent on *εἶναι* (*ὑπάρχειν*) and *γίνεσθαι* (not on the predicates joined to them);
224 for *ἐστὶ* or *γίνεται μοι φόβος* can only mean: the *φόβον εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι* applies, refers, to me. From it result the following uses:

¹ This construction is unknown also in the O. T. Of the parallel passages quoted by Bretsch. one, Sus. 41, is *κατέκριναν αὐτὴν ἀποθανεῖν*, and the other, vs. 48, is absol. *κατεκρίνατε θυγατέρα Ἰσραὴλ*.

a. Without a predicate, *εἶναι τινι* expresses property (possession), *γίνεσθαι τινι* impartation: Luke ii. 7 οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος *they had no room*, Acts viii. 21; x. 6; iii. 6; xxi. 23; Matt. xviii. 12; Luke i. 14 ἔσται χαρά σοι, Matt. xvi. 22 οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο *this will not befall thee*, Acts xx. 3, 16; ii. 43 ἐγένετο πάση ψυχῇ φόβος *fear fell upon*, Rom. xi. 25. Elliptically 1 Cor. vi. 13; v. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Jno. ii. 4 (Krü. 59).

b. With a predicate (mostly a substantive), *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι τινι* denotes what quality *for a person* a thing has or receives, objectively as well as subjectively (i.e. in his own opinion); as, 1 Cor. viii. 9 μήπως ἡ ἐξουσία . . . πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν, i. 18 ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστίν etc. ix. 2; xiv. 22; Rom. ii. 14; vii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 3; ix. 3; Phil. i. 28. But *become* (redound) *to* (Krü. 59) is usually expressed in the N. T. by *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι εἰς τι*.

3. *Substantives* derived from verbs governing a Dative sometimes take the same case, instead of the ordinary Genitive; as, 2 Cor. ix. 12 εὐχαρισταί τῷ θεῷ (not 11), somewhat like εὐχαὶ τοῖς θεοῖς Plat. legg. 7, 800 a., see Wytttenbach, Plut. Mor. I. 154 Lips.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. 101, and rep. I. 372; Ast, Plat. Polit. 451; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. 374; Fr. Mr. p. 63. Compare besides τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ Luke iv. 16; Acts xvii. 2 (Plat. legg. 658 e. τὸ ἦθος ἡμῶν) and τὸ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ 1 Cor. vii. 35. The case is different in Luke vii. 12 υἱὸς μονογενὴς τῇ μητρὶ *a son who was to his mother an only son* (thus not strictly for the Genitive, cf. Tob. iii. 15 μονογενὴς τῷ πατρὶ, Judg. xi. 34), with which the Dative of relationship—cf. Luke v. 10; Rom. iv. 12 (Bttm. Philoct. p. 102 sq.; Boisson. Nic. p. 271; Ast, Plat. Polit. 451, 519, also legg. p. 9)—is not to be confounded. On Rom. iv. 12 see § 61, 5, p. 555.

Also in Matt. xxvii. 7 ἡγόρασαν τὸν ἀγρὸν . . . εἰς ταφὴν τοῖς ξένοις *for a burying-ground for strangers*, the Dative belongs to the substantive; cf. Strabo 17, 807 πρὸς ἐπιδειξιν τοῖς ξένοις. See Schoem. Isae. p. 264; 199 Krü. 68 f. But in 1 Cor. vii. 28 the Dative may be referred to the verb 190 of the sentence. Yet see Bhdy. S. 88. 6th ed.

4. The Dative, without being directly involved in the signification of a verb or noun, expresses the relation of the action to some one: 2 Cor. ii. 12 οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἀνεσι τῷ πνεύματί μου *for my spirit* (1 Cor. vii. 28), or Luke xviii. 31 πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα . . . τῷ υἱῷ 225 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου *which were written for him* (that they might receive fulfilment in him), (Matt. xiii. 14; Jude 14). Cf. besides, Matt. xiii. 52; Phil. i. 27; 1 Tim. i. 9; Rev. xxi. 2. Especially deserving of notice are,

a. The Dative of *opinion* or *decision* (cf. above, No. 2); as, Plato, Phaed. 101 d. εἰ σοι ἀλλήλοις ξυμφωνεῖ ἢ διαφωνεῖ; Soph. Oed. C. 1446. So in the expressions Acts vii. 20 ἀστέως τῷ θεῷ, 2 Cor. x. 4 δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ.¹ See also 1 Cor. ix. 2. Cf. Wyttenb. Plat. Phaed. as above; Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 615; Krü. 61.

b. The Dative of *interest*, 2 Cor. v. 13 εἴτε ἐξέστημεν, θεῷ· εἴτε σωφρονούμεν, ὑμῖν (Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 22), or, more definitely, the dativus commodi and incommodi, Jno. iii. 26 ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, *to whom*, in favor of whom (Luke iv. 22; Rom. x. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; cf. Xen. M. 1, 2, 21). On the other hand, Matt. xxiii. 31 μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστε etc., *against* yourselves, cf. Jas. v. 3. Cf. besides, Heb. vi. 6; Jude 1; Rom. xiii. 2. On Rev. viii. 3, see Ewald. (But Eph. v. 19 λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς — ἀλλήλοις — ψαλμοῖς, etc., is a simple Dative of direction: *speaking to one another*, etc.)

5. The preceding illustrations suffice to show that the Dative is as closely related to the prepositions εἰς (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 360)² and πρὸς (cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 558), as the Gen. is to the prepositions ἐκ and ἀπο. Hence in many phrases one of the former prepositions is used instead of the Dative. Thus we find, as every one knows, not only λέγω τινί and πρὸς τινα (the latter is in Matt. and Mark the usual indeed almost invariable expression, see Schulz, Parab. v. Verwalt. S. 38) — cf. κράζειν τινί Rev. vii. 2; xiv. 15, φωνεῖν τινι Rev. xiv. 18, — but also εὔχεσθαι θεῷ Acts xxvi. 29 (Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 12; Demosth. Conon. 729 c.; Plut. Coriol. 9; Xen. Eph. 4, 3), and εὔχεσθαι πρὸς θεόν 2 Cor. xiii. 7 (Xen. M. 1, 3, 2) cf. Phil. iv. 6, βοᾶν τινι Luke xviii. 7 and β. πρὸς τινα Hos. vii. 14, ψεύδεσθαι τινι (Acts v. 4; Ps. xvii. 45; lxxvii. 36; Jer. v. 12, but not in Greek authors) and ψεύδ. πρὸς τινα (*to lie against one, to be false towards one*) Xen. A. 1, 3, 5, καταλλάττειν τινί and 200 πρὸς τινα Xen. vectig. 6, 8; Joseph. antt. 14, 11, 3,³ εὐδοκεῖν εἰς τινα 7th ed. 2 Pet. i. 17 and τινί in Greek writers (Pol. 4, 22, 7; 1 Macc. i. 43), 226 μάχεσθαι τινι Xen. A. 4, 5, 12; Plato, rep. 3, 407 a. and πρὸς τινα Jno. vi. 52; Iliad. 17, 98; Plato, Lach. 191 d.; Lucian. conv. 42, and often (also in Sept.),⁴ ὀμιλεῖν τινι and πρὸς τινα Luke xxiv. 14;

¹ Τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ, as Lchm. and Tdf. read Jas. ii. 5, would be similar.

² In modern Greek the Acc. with εἰς serves very commonly as a circumlocution for the Dative, even in its simplest relations; as, λέγω εἰς τὸν φίλον μου dico amico meo, (German, gegen m. Fr.), see v. Lüdemann, Lehrb. 90.

³ Col. i. 20 ἀποκαταλλ. εἰς would be analogous, if this were not designedly a pregnant construction; see Mey.

⁴ So besides παραβάλλειν τί τινι (Her. 4. 198) also τι πρὸς τι occurs (Joseph. Ap. 2. 15). Otherwise Mark iv. 30 ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλλωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, see Fr.; but the reading here varies.

Xen. M. 4, 3, 2. The construction with a preposition doubtless ^{6th ed.} 191 attracted the N. T. writers, through the influence of the explicit and graphic idiom of their vernacular tongue, and hence where the Dat. commodi or incommodi would have been sufficient for native Greek authors, we find *εἰς*: Acts xxiv. 17 *ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσαν εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου*, Luke vii. 30 *τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς to their own harm* (so that *εἰς* also signifies *contra*).¹ On the other hand *κηρύττειν* or *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι εἰς*, being constantly followed by the Plural of the noun, denotes *to make known among*, Mark xiii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 25; Luke xxiv. 47 (Paus. 8, 5, 8). In Matt. xx. 1 *μισθοῦσθαι εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα* means hire, not *for*, but *into* his vineyard. In the same way, the construction is pregnant in Mark viii. 19 *τοὺς ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς τοὺς πεντακισχίλ. broke* (and divided) *among* the etc. Likewise in Matt. v. 22 *ἐνόχος εἰς τὴν γέενναν liable into Gehenna*, i.e. to go, be cast (on the other hand *τῇ κρίσει, τῷ συνεδρίῳ*). Also Rom. viii. 18 *τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς* is an abridged expression (see Fr.) similar to the Hebrew *לְפָנַי* 1 Sam. iii. 7. Lastly, in the phrases *ὠφέλιμος πρὸς τι* 1 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Tim. iii. 16 (with *εἰς* Xen. Oec. 5, 11 cf. *χρήσιμος εἰς* Wisd. xiii. 11), *εὐθετος εἰς τι* Luke xiv. 35 (Dion. H. de Thuc. 55, 3, with *πρὸς* Pol. 26, 5, 6; D. S. 5, 37) the preposition with the Acc. must not be regarded as put for the Dative, since *useful, adapted, for, to something* is quite an appropriate expression, while the Dative would be more suitable in reference to the Person. Yet cf. Luke ix. 62 var.

The phrase *πιστεύειν εἰς* or *ἐπὶ τινα* (Acts ix. 42; xxii. 19) obviously means in Christian phraseology more than *πιστεύειν τινί* (*credere, confidere alicui*), and is to be taken as pregnant: in faith to resign one's self *unto* any one, to profess one's self a believer *on* one, *fide se ad aliquem applicare*.² Likewise *παραδίδόναι εἰς* (to deliver up *to* any one) is not simply equivalent ²²⁷ to *παρ. τινί*, but rather denotes deliver into the power of, surrender to, Matt. ²⁰¹ x. 17; hence it is used with *θάνατος* Matt. x. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 11, *θλίψις* Matt. ^{7th ed.} xxiv. 9, *ἀκαθαρσία* Rom. i. 24 etc.; cf. Xen. Hel. 1, 7, 8. The construction *ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσέλγείᾳ εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης* etc. Eph. iv. 19 requires no explanation.

¹ In Luke viii. 43 the text. rec. has *εἰς ἰατροὺς προσαναλώσασα δλον τὸν βίον*, but the best Codd. [Sin. too] have *ἰατροῖς*. The latter must be preferred, as the former appears to be a correction. In Greek authors, that is to say, the verb is usually construed with *εἰς*, Xen. Cyrop. 2, 4, 9; Aelian. 14, 32.

² *Πιστεύειν ἐν Χριστῷ* is to be understood in the same way, yet this expression cannot be unquestionably established from Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 13; we find, however, in Mark i. 15 *πιστ. ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*, which is not essentially different. Further, *ἡ πρὸς τινα πίστις*, and the like (Schwarz, Comment. p. 1102), do not prove the expression *πιστεύειν πρὸς* or *εἰς τινα* to be pure Greek.

Note. The Dat. is related also to *μετά*. Accordingly, in the N. T. we find *πολεμεῖν μετά τινος* Rev. xii. 7; xiii. 4 for *πολεμεῖν τινι*, also *κρίνεσθαι μετά τινος* 1 Cor. vi. 6 (7). In other relations a circumlocution for the Dat. is formed, a. By means of *ἐνώπιον* Acts vi. 5 *ἤρεσεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους* (Gen. xxxiv. 18; xli. 37; 2 Sam. iii. 36, etc.) cf. 1 Jno. iii. 22, *προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ* (Luke iv. 7; Rev. xv. 4). This, like almost all constructions with *ἐνώπιον* (עֲנִי), is Hebraistic. b. After *πέποιθα* by *ἐν* Phil. iii. 3, or *ἐπί* with Dat. Mark x. 24; 2 Cor. i. 9 and with Acc. Matt. xxvii. 43 (1 Macc. x. 77), [or lastly by *εἰς*, yet only in Gal. v. 10]. c. After *ἀκολουθεῖν* by *ὅπισω* Matt. x. 38; see § 33.

That the Dative can be employed precisely for the local *πρός* or *εἰς* with the Acc. has been denied by Bornem. (in Rosenm. Repertor. II. 253 and in the neu. krit. Journ. d. theol. Literat. VI. 146 f., cf. also ad Anab. p. 23), and also by Mey. on Acts ii. 33. It is true, the examples adduced from Greek poets by Fr. (Conject. I. 42) do not establish the rule (for prose), and the N. T. passages may be explained differently: in Acts ii. 33 and v. 31 *ἵψουν τῇ δεξιᾷ* may signify *by (his) right hand*; in Rev. ii. 16 *σοι* is simply a Dat. incommodi; even Acts xxi. 16 might be rendered (after Beza and Glass.) *adducentes secum, apud quem hospitaremur Mnasonem*, so that *Μνάσωνι* dependent on *ἄγοντες* as Acc. of the object (*Μνάσωνα κ.τ.λ.*) would be incorporated into the relative clause. But the latter rendering has little probability.¹ Sooner could we, according to Bornem.'s more recent suggestion (Luke p. 177 sq.), resolve the attraction in the above passage thus: *ἄγοντες (ἡμᾶς)*
 228 *παρὰ Μνάσωνά τινα . . . παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν* (as to *ἄγειν παρὰ τινα* cf. Her. 1, 86; 3, 15); even this, however, is not the easiest way. The construction *ἄγειν τινί* *bring to one* may indeed be unusual (yet see the Note) in Attic prose, but in later prose authors we find expressions entirely similar, as *φοιτᾶν τινι* Philostr. Soph. 2, 1, 14 (Wytttenbach, Plutarch. Mor. IV. 339), *ἤκειν τινί* Plutarch.
 202 *Acem. 16, 1, εἰσφέρειν τινά τινι* Malal. 10, p. 231. On Acts xxi. 16
 7th ed. especially, however, cf. Xen. Eph. 3, 6, p. 63 *πότερον ἡγόμην Ἀβρο-*

¹ Not precisely on account of the annexed predicate *ἀρχ. μαθητῇ* (Bengel's n. Archiv III. 175), as that refers to Mnason to show that Paul could trust him perfectly; but rather because it is not credible that his companions would have brought a host for Paul with them from Caesarea, as there were in Jerusalem so many trustworthy Christians. According to this view one would have to assume that this Mnason was either accidentally present in Caesarea, or that he had a residence in two places at the same time. By dropping *secum*, which is not implied in *ἄγοντες*, the statement would become simpler: they brought (introduced) Mnason in Jerusalem after their arrival; but then the position of the words would not be suitable.

κόμῃ, and Epiph. vit. p. 340 d. ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν Ἀθανασίῳ τῷ πάππῳ.¹ See also Bhdy. 95; Held, Plut. Aem. P. p. 200. Hence ὑφούν τῇ δεξιᾷ may without hesitation be translated: *raise to the right hand*; cf. vs. 34 (of Acts ii.) κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου; cf. Lucian. asin. 39.

In Luke ii. 41 ἐπορεύοντο ... εἰς Ἱερ. τῇ ἑορτῇ is not *to the festival* 193 (Luth. *auf das Osterfest*), but either *on account of the f.* (see below, 6 c.), ^{6th ed.} or, as a loose expression, *at the f.* (as we also say: they made a yearly journey *at Easter* to ... to attend divine service). There would be more reason for referring to the preceding rule Mark xiv. 53 συνέρχονται αὐτῷ *conveniant eum*, and Jno. xi. 33 τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰουδαίους (Fr. Mr. 648). Still, as appears to me, in both these passages the Dative is really governed by σύν: the second signifying simply, who had come *with her*; and the first, *they came with him*, that is, with Jesus (verse 54), see BCrus.

Further, different from the foregoing construction is that of the Dative joined to verbs of *coming* in an ideal sense; as, Acts xxi. 31 ἀνέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ compare our *tidings came to him*. A similar usage occurs frequently and indisputably in Greek authors; as, Plutarch. Brut. 27 μέλλοντι αὐτῷ διαβαίνειν ... ἦκεν ἀγγελία περὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς, and Pomp. 13 τῷ Σύλλῳ πρώτη μὲν ἦλθεν ἀγγελία. Cf. ἀνάγειν τί τινι to bring a thing before one (notify to), Malal. 3 p. 63; 10 p. 254.

6. In a wider use the Dative of the thing is employed of every thing *in reference to which* an action or a state comes to pass. Accordingly, it is used

a. To designate the sphere to which a general predicate is to be conceived as confined (cf. Bhdy. 84; Krü. 74); as, 1 Cor. xiv. 20 μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε children *in understanding*, children *in reference to malice* (Plat. Aleib. pr. 122 c.), Rom. iv. 20 ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει *he grew strong in faith*, 229 Phil. ii. 8 σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, iii. 5; Matt. v. [3] 8; xi. 29; Acts vii. 51; xiv. 8; xvi. 5; xviii. 2; xx. 22; Rev. iv. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 34; Heb. v. 11; xi. 12; xii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18; v. 9 (Pol. 20, 4, 7); Gal. i. 22; Rom. xii. 10 f.; Col. ii. 5; Eph. iv. 18, 23 (Mth. 898; Fr. Rom. III. 68). Such a Dat. is intercalated in Eph. ii. 3 ἡμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς as respects nature, naturally, children of wrath.

b. Of the rule, or standard, *according to which* something takes place; as, Acts xv. 1 εἰὰν μὴ περιτέμνησθε τῷ ἔθει Μωϋσέως (on the other hand, xvii. 2 κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός, and more frequently κατὰ

¹ Yet ἄγειν τινί (cf. προσάγειν τινί § 52, 4, 14.) is not in all these cases used in a purely local or material sense; but rather means *introduce to one's acquaintance*. Similarly φοιτᾶν τινι (to attend one as teacher), different from φοιτᾶν πρὸς τ. Epict. ench. 33, 13.

ἔθος) cf. Xen. C. 1, 2, 4; Sext. Emp. 2, 6; Strabo 15, 715 (Tob. iii. 8; 2 Macc. vi. 1).

c. Of the occasion or cause (*on account of*); as, Rom. xi. 20 τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν *because of unbelief* (cf. 30 ἠλεήθητε τῇ τοῦ 203 7th ed. τῶν ἀπειθείᾳ), Gal. vi. 12; Col. i. 21—also of the motive (*through, from, etc.*) 1 Cor. viii. 7 τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσι, 2 Cor. i. 15; Rom. iv. 20. See Diog. L. 2, 57; Heliod. 1, 12, 33; Paus. 8, 7, 3; Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 1; cf. Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 392; Goeller, Thuc. p. 157, 184, etc.; Mtth. 894 f.; Bhdy. 102 f.; Krü. 73.

The use of the Dative in Rev. viii. 4 ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς τῶν θυμιαμάτων ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων, etc. is more strange, and has given rise to numerous conjectures. The simplest translation probably is: *there went up the smoke of the incense (of the angels) for the prayers*, i.e. the ascending smoke availed for the prayers, to attend and render them more acceptable (on the representation see Ewald in loc.). 194 6th ed. Expositors who supplied σύν took the same view of the expression. On the other hand the rendering *inter preces sanctorum* is by no means justifiable. In 2 Cor. vii. 7 the Dat. τῷ πράγματι is certainly allowable, yet harsh for the language of the N.T.; ἐν τῷ πράγματι has good authorities in its favor, and the ἐν was probably omitted, either because it was absorbed by the εἶναι or because ἐν παντί ... was taken with πράγματι.

7. In the uses adduced under 6. the Dative of *direction*, and consequently (according to Greek views) the Dative proper, is still to be detected more or less clearly; but this case, by a further outward extension of its import to whatever accompanies the action, passes over altogether into the Ablative,

d. When it designates the *mode* and *manner*, as casus modalis (Bhdy. 100 f.), 1 Cor. xi. 5 προσευχομένη ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ *with the head uncovered*, x. 30; Col. ii. 11; Phil. i. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 4 (Jude 6), also Rom. viii. 24 τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν (and Eph. v. 19);—or the *instrument* (casus instrumentalis Mdv. 45, yet cf. Krü. 72), as 1 Pet. i. 18 οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε, Gal. ii. 13 ὥστε . . . συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει (2 Pet. iii. 17 cf. Zosim. 5, 6), Eph. i. 13; Col. ii. 7; Phil. iii. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 7 τίς στρατεύεται 230 ἰδίοις ὀφωνίοις ποτέ *with his own resources*, at his own expense, Heb. vi. 17 ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ, i. 3; Rom. xv. 18,—likewise Acts i. 5 ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι (xi. 16), Jno. xxi. 8 τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον, Mark vi. 32 (though elsewhere we find ἐν πλοίῳ, Matt. xiv. 13; Acts xxviii. 11; D. S. 19, 54), Acts xii. 2; Rom. i. 20; iii. 24; Tit. iii. 7; Eph. v. 19, etc. To this head may also be referred Heb. xii. 18 ὄρος κεκαυ-

μένον πυρὶ igni ardens, *burning in*, with, *fire*, (Exod. iii. 2; Deut. iv. 11; ix. 15; cf. Lob. Paralip. p. 523 sq.). In Rom. xii. 12 τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες is *through* (in) *hope* rejoicing. In reference to δεήσει in 2 Cor. ix. 14 I now agree with Mey. We often find ἐν or διὰ (especially of persons) used for the instrumental Dative; as, Rom. xv. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 23, 26 f.

A virtual Ablative will be perceived also in μεθύσκεσθαι οἶνον Eph. v. 18 (Prov. iv. 17), and in πληροῦσθαι τινι Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. vii. 4 (Eurip. 204 Herc. fur. 372, cf. πλήρης τινί Eurip. Bacch. 18—oftener with the Gen.—^{7th ed.} Bhdv. 168, in later writers πλησθέντες ἀγνοία Malal. p. 54). (But in Eph. iii. 19 εἰς with the Acc. is not used for the Ablative. The preposition expresses rather: *filled up to the fulness*, etc.)

8. In all these (6 a. et seq.) relations, however, prepositions are not rarely and sometimes even more usually employed,—both in Greek prose, and still more in N. T. Greek,—with or without a modification of the meaning; viz.

For a. ἐν, 1 Pet. iv. 1 ἐν σαρκὶ παθόν in connection with σαρκὶ παθ., Tit. i. 13 cf. ii. 2; διαφέρειν ἐν τινι 1 Cor. xv. 41 (Soph. Oed. C. 1112; Dion. H. ep. p. 225. Krü.).

For b. κατά, as almost always κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, εἰωθός Luke iv. 16; Acts xvii. 2.

For c. διὰ with the Acc. see § 49 c. p. 398 sq.

For d. διὰ or ἐν also μετά. Thus we find instead of βαπτίζεσθαι ὕδατι usually ἐν ὕδατι (*in water*) Matt. iii. 11; Jno. i. 26, 31 (but also ἐν πνεύματι), for βίᾳ always μετὰ βίας Acts v. 26; xxiv. 7; for πίστει also διὰ πίστεως, etc. But in Eph. ii. 8 τῇ χάριτι ἔστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως and Rom. iii. 24 the Dat. expresses the motive, διὰ πίστ. the subjective means; and in 2 Pet. iii. 5 διὰ refers to the material means, the Dat. to the immaterial. For παντὶ τρόπῳ Phil. i. 18 we find ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ 2 Thess. iii. 16. On the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 3 the Dat. is used of the means, and ἐν denotes the state (the disposition).

When, however, N. T. expositors took ἐν simply for a nota dativi (cf. 195 Blomfield, Aeschyl. Agam. 1425, and Eurip. Med. p. 628), even where a ^{8th ed.} Dative proper (not an Ablative) is required, they went too far, and their opinion could not find even a remote support in the Hebrew idiom. Most 231 of the passages quoted are plausible only because in such connection elsewhere the Dative of a person is commonly employed (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 11; iii. 1; i. 18), but in reality they are quite irrelevant. In Acts iv. 12 δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις is most certainly: *given* (promulged) *among* men,

cf. 2 Cor. viii. 1; ¹ Gal. i. 16 ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί *to reveal his son in me* (ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου); 1 Jno. iv. 9 ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, the love of God was manifested *in* (respect to, *on*) *us* which differs unquestionably from *to us*; 1 Cor. xiv. 11 ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοί βάρβαρος *according to me, in my estimation* (meo judicio, cf. Jacobs, Athen. p. 183; Döderlein, Oed. Col. p. 529; Wex, Soph. Antig. v. 549); 1 Cor. ii. 6 σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις means: *among or with, before, (coram see Plat. symp. 175 e., frequently in the orators § 48 a.) them that are perfect, etc.* (i.e. when we have to deal with such) cf. Judith vi. 2. Baumgarten has in the main correctly explained 2 Cor. iv. 3 ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκα-
 205 λυμένοι: *is hid in (among, with) them that perish.* On ὁμολογεῖν ἐν τινι
 1th ed. see § 32, 3 b. Acts xiii. 15 and Col. ii. 13 require no explanation, and Eph.
 ii. 5 νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι is not grammatically parallel to the last
 passage. In Eph. i. 20 ἐνήργησεν ἐν Χριστῷ is quite regular: (*power*) *which*
he exhibited in Christ (by raising him from the dead). Matt. xvii. 12
 ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν (Mark ix. 13 ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ) is: *they did,*
perpetrated on him, cf. Mark xiv. 6; Jno. xiv. 30; Luke xxiii. 31; 1 Cor.
 ix. 15 (Gen. xl. 14; Judith vii. 24). Likewise correct is the expression
 2 Cor. x. 12 μετρεῖν ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς: *measuring themselves on (with)*
themselves, though in Greek authors the Dative alone is in use, Aristot.
 rhet. 2, 12; Herod. 1, 6, 2.

9. *Time*, as that substratum with which all events are connected, is expressed by the Dative in answer to the question *When*; whether it denotes,

a. A space of time; as, Luke viii. 29 πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν *within (during) a long time*, Acts viii. 11; xiii. 20; Rom. xvi. 25; Jno. ii. 20 (not Eph. iii. 5); cf. Joseph. antt. 1, 3, 5 τὸ ὕδωρ ἡμέραις τεσσαράκοντα ὄλαις κατεφέρετο, Soph. Trach. 599 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, Aeschin. ep. 1. p. 121 c.; Diod. S. 19, 93.

b. Or (more frequently) a point of time, *at* which something takes place;—and that, too, in words that directly signify the notion of time or a division of time (with a numeral or Genitive annexed,
 196 Krü. 57), as Luke xii. 20 ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί, Mark vi. 21 Ἡρώδης τοῖς
 6th ed. γενεαῖς αὐτοῦ δεῖπνον ἐποίησε, Matt. [xiv. 6 γενεαῖς γενομένοις according to Lachmann's reading, sustained also by Cod. Sinait.]
 xx. 19 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσεται, xxvi. 17; Luke xiii. 16; Acts
 232 vii. 8; xii. 21; xxi. 26; xxii. 13; xxvii. 23, or in names of festivals (Wannowski, p. 86) Luke xiii. 14 τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσε (xiv. 1),
 Matt. xii. 1 τοῖς σάββασιν etc. Cf. Plat. conv. 174 a.; Mdv. 48.

¹ So also in Diog. L. 1, 105 τί ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθὸν τε καὶ φαῦλον, where, too, the Latin translator has: *quidnam esset hominibus bonum etc.* Cf. besides, Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 628 δουλεύουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτῶν, Arrian. Epict. 1, 18, 8.

Yet *ἐν* is inserted, regularly in the last case, and frequently also in the first (especially with *ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* or *ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως*), even in Luke (iii. 1; i. 26), cf. Krü. 57; the expression *τῇ ἑορτῇ* or *ταῖς ἑορταῖς* without *ἐν* is rare even in Greek authors (Wanowski, 88).

The Dative of *place* is not deeply rooted in the N. T. Before names of cities *ἐν* is always put; as, *ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐν Τύρῳ* Acts xvii. 6; xix. 1; Rom. i. 7; 2 Tim. i. 17; iv. 20, etc. But *ὁδός* occasionally dispenses with the preposition; as, Jas. ii. 25 *ἐτέρᾳ ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα* (where, however, the prepos. was hardly necessary) cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 16, *ὁδῷ πορεύεσθαι* 2 Pet. ii. 15; Acts xiv. 16 (trop.) cf. Lucian. Tim. 5 *ὁδῷ βαδίζειν* (Fr. Rom. III. 140 sq.), *στοιχεῖν τοῖς ἵχνεσι* Rom. iv. 12 (*βαίνειν ἵχνεσι* Plut. Sol. 30), with which are to be classed also the figurative expressions *πορ. τῷ φόβῳ* Acts ix. 31; xiv. 16; Prov. xxviii. 26; 2 Sam. xv. 11; 1 Macc. vi. 23; Bar. i. 18; ii. 10; iv. 13; Tob. i. 2; iv. 5 (interchangeably with *πορ. ἐν* 1 Pet. iv. 3, etc.) and even *περιπατεῖν τοῖς ῥέσι* Acts xxi. 21; 2 Cor. xii. 18, Gal. v. 16; Rom. xiii. 13. Generally, even in Greek prose, the use of the Dativus 206
localis is very limited; see Mdv. 48; Poppo, Thuc. 1, 143. 7th ed.

10. The Dative (of a person) with Passives instead of *ὑπό, παρά*, etc. with the Gen., is but seldom employed (and then usually with the Perfect): Luke xxiii. 15 *οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶ πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ* (Isocr. paneg. c. 18). Yet this construction is not entirely the same as that with *ὑπό* etc.; it denotes the person not by whom something has been done, but to whom what has been done belongs (Mdv. 45; Krü. 72; Benseler, Isocr. Evag. p. 13). It is used in particular with *εὐρίσκεσθαι* 2 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 14; Rom. x. 20 Sept.; cf. besides Luke xxiv. 35 (Jas. iii. 18) Phil. iv. 5 (Acts xxiv. 14), also 2 Pet. ii. 19 where *ᾧ τις ἡττηται* means, *by what a man is overcome*, to what he is inferior, (in classic Greek *ἡττᾶσθαι τινος*). But in Acts xvi. 9 *ὤφθη ὄραμα τῷ Παύλῳ* means *became visible to him* (as often elsewhere *ὀφθῆναι τινι* appear to one). In Jas. iii. 7 *τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ* means rather *by the nature of man* (*ingeniis hominum*). In general, the Dative of a thing with Passives (probably also in Rom. xii. 16, see Fr. in loc.) is less surprising, as it coincides with the Dative of the means. In Heb. iv. 2 *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* indicates probably the persons *with* or *in* whom the *μὴ συγκρ. τῇ πίστει* occurred. Lastly, Matt. v. 21 ff. *ἐβρόθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις* should be translated: *to them* of old time; see Tholuck, Bergpr. 158 f. The above use of the Dative (of a pers.) after Passives is known likewise in Greek prose, but it is especially frequent after participles; cf. Dem. Olynth. 3, p. 12 c.; 233

Theocrin. 507 c. ; coron. 324 a. ; Conon. 731 b. ; Diog. L. 8, 6 ; Philostr. her. 4, 2.

Note 1. The Dative in Col. ii. 14 *ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασι*, is noticeable. Some expositors explain it *ὃ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν* quod constabat placitis (mos.), conformably to Eph. ii. 15 *τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας* — an explanation correct doubtless as respects the sense, but at variance with the grammar ; for according to it Paul must have written : *χειρόγρ. τὸ ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι*. Now in the first place as regards Eph. ii. 15 the expression *τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι* must undoubtedly be taken as *one* idea : *commandments in* (individual) *ordinances*, cf. § 20, 2. And in Col., all things considered, *δόγμασι* cannot be taken otherwise than as closely connected with *τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον* : *the bond* (in force) *against us through the ordinances*, and Paul perhaps employed the word *δόγμασι* in this passage to bring out the notion with prominence. Meyer's explanation : *what has been written with commandments* (Dat. like *what has been written with letters*), is the more forced, because the word *χειρόγραφον* has acquired from usage so distinct and independent a meaning that it can scarcely take such a Dative after it, as if equivalent to *γεγραμμένον*.

Note 2. What Kühnöl remarks on Matt. viii. 1, viz. that Datives absolute are sometimes put for Genitives absolute, as *καταβάντι αὐτῷ* for *καταβάντος αὐτοῦ*, Matt. xxi. 23 *ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ* for *ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ*, was indeed formerly believed, in general, even by scholars (Fischer, Well. III. a. p. 391 ; Wyttenbach, Plut. Mor. II. 304 ; Heupel, Mark p. 79). In reality, however, all such Datives (at least in the better class of authors, Wannowski, p. 91 sqq.) may be as easily explained from the nature of the Dative, as the Genitive absolute is from the nature of the Genitive ; see Bhdy. 82 ; Stallb. Plat. Protag. 60 ; Rost, Gr. 712 f. The remark cannot with the slightest plausibility be applied to the passages quoted above from the N. T., as both *καταβάντι* and *ἐλθόντι* follow the verb *ἀκολουθεῖν* ; at the same time it must be confessed that the author might also have written : *καταβάντος αὐτοῦ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί*, cf. Matt. viii. 28 ; Mark v. 2 var. There is only this peculiarity in these constructions, that in all *αὐτῷ* is repeated (because several other words are inserted between the Dative of the participle and the governing verb). In the passages quoted by Kypke I. 47 from Pausan. and Joseph., either there is simply a pronoun joined to the participle, or the pronoun is directly connected with the verb (Joseph. antt. 8, 13, 4) ; accordingly, they do not prove the point in question. Even in Acts xxii. 6, 17 the Datives are not properly absolute. In the latter passage *μοι ὑποστρέψαντι*, precisely as in vs. 6, belongs with *ἐγένετο*. Then follows a quite different construction (with the Genit. absol.) : *accidit mihi reverso, cum precabar in templo*, etc. Cf. Paus. 3, 10, 7 and 25, 3.

Note 3. Two Datives, the one of a person and the other (explaining, more closely defining) of a thing, occur in 2 Cor. xii. 7 *ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ*

τῇ σαρκί *a thorn was given me for (in) the flesh* (Exod. iv. 9; Gen. xlvii. 24) cf. in Homer δίδου οἱ ἡνία χερσίν; Reisig, Soph. Oedip. C. 266; Elmsley, Eurip. Bacch. p. 49, 80, ed. Lips.; Bornem. Xen. conviv. p. 214; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 811; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 278. The two Datives in Eph. iii. 5; Rom. vii. 25; Heb. iv. 2; Rev. iv. 3 are of a different nature, and require no remark.

Note 4. A very singular Dative occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 14 μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις, where some understand σύν, while others attribute 198 this meaning to the Dative itself. But, though the Dat. is sometimes to be resolved by *with* (Reitz, Lucian. VI. 599, Bip.; Mth. 907; cf. Polyæn. 8, 28), this is an entirely different case. The apostle seems to have expressed himself elliptically, and to have suited the Dative rather to the thought than to the words. He evidently means: μὴ γίν. ἑτερ. καὶ οὕτως ὁμοζυγοῦντες (συζυγ.) ἀπίστοις *do not put yourselves into an unsuitable yoke, that is, be not united in the same yoke with unbelievers.*

§ 32. ACCUSATIVE.

1. The Accusative is strictly the Objective Case when joined to *transitive* verbs (active, middle, or deponent); as, κόπτειν τὴν θύραν, κόπτεσθαι τ. κεφαλὴν, φυλάσσειν τ. κήπον, φυλάσσεσθαι τὰς ἐντολάς. It must be remarked, however, that,

a. Not only in later and especially in Biblical Greek, many 208 neuter verbs received a transitive (causative) meaning (μαθητεῖν εἰν τινά § 38, 1.); but,

b. In general, certain classes of verbal notions which we consider as either entirely or mainly intransitive, were regarded by the Greeks as transitive. Such are,

a. Verbs denoting *an affection of the mind*; as, ἐλεεῖν Matt. ix. 27; Mark v. 19; Phil. ii. 27, etc. (Plato, symp. 173 c.; Ael. 13, 31) and οἰκτεῖρειν Rom. ix. 15, LXX. (Soph. El. 1403; Xen. C. 5, 4, 32; Lucian. abd. 6; Tim. 99), ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τινά and τι Mark viii. 38; Heb. xi. 16; Rom. i. 16 (Plat. Soph. 247 c.; cf. αἰσχύνεσθαι Soph. 235 Oed. R. 1079; Eurip. Io 1074); the last once takes ἐπί, Rom. vi. 21 cf. Isocr. permut. 778. On the contrary, σπλαγγνύεσθαι is regularly construed with ἐπί, only once does it govern the Gen. Matt. xviii. 27, see § 33. Ἐντρέπεσθαι τινά, *to reverence one*, Matt. xxi. 37; Luke xviii. 2; Heb. xii. 9, is a later construction, from the time of Plut.; earlier authors said ἐντρ. τινι.

β. Verbs denoting *to treat one well or ill (harm, benefit)*, or to *speak well or ill of one*: ἀδικεῖν, βλάπτειν, ὠφελεῖν, λυμαίνεσθαι, ὑβρίζειν τινά (Xen. Hell. 2, 4, 17; Lucian. pisc. 6); ἐπηρεάζειν

τινά (with Dat. pers. Xen. M. 1, 2, 31), λουδορεῖν τινα Jno. ix. 28; Mtth. 871, βλασφημεῖν τινα Matt. xxvii. 39; Acts xix. 37; Rev. xiii. 6, etc., yet also εἰς τινα Luke xii. 10; cf. Demosth. cor. nav. p. 715 c.; Diod. S. 2, 18 and LXX. hist. Drac. 9 (like the Greek *ὀνειδίζειν εἰς τινα* and *ὕβριζειν εἰς τινα* Lucian. Tim. 31) and *ἐν τινι* 2 Pet. ii. 12 (in Greek authors also *περί τινος* Isocr. permut. 736), *ὀνειδίζειν τινά* Matt. v. 11 (LXX. cf. Rom. xv. 3) Schaef. Plutarch. V. 347 (earlier writers say *ὀνειδίζ. τινί* or *εἰς τινα*), *κακῶς ἐρεῖν τινα* Acts xxiii. 5 (Plat. Euthyd. 284 e.; D. S. Vat. p. 66), also *καταρᾶσθαι τινα* Matt. v. 44; Jas. iii. 9 (Wisdom. xii. 11; Ecclus. iv. 5, etc., with Dative Xen. A. 7, 7, 48). All these constructions are finally grounded on the simple *λέγειν* or *εἰπεῖν τινα*, Jno. i. 15; viii. 27; Phil. iii. 18, etc. (Jud. vii. 4); cf. Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 1404; Mtth. II. 929. On the other hand, we find *καλῶς ποιεῖν* with the
 199 Dative of a person, Luke vi. 27 (Acts xvi. 28 *μηδὲν πράξης σεαυτῷ*
 6th ed. *κακόν* is of another kind, and this, with similar expressions, is frequent in Greek writers, Lys. accus. Agor. 41; Xen. C. 5, 4, 11; 5, 5, 14; 8, 7, 24), and also *εὖ ποιεῖν* Mark xiv. 7. In Greek prose the Acc. is here always preferred, see Biblioth. Brem. nova I. 277. Yet cf. Odys. 14, 289 *ὃς δὴ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐώργει*. But *ποιεῖν τινά* *τι* to do something to one occurs also in the N. T. Matt. xxvii. 22; Mark xv. 12. Cf. Aristoph. nub. 258 sq.

γ. Ὀμνύειν τινά Jas. v. 12 (οὐρανόν) *swear by*, cf. Hos. iv. 15; Xen. C. 5, 4, 31; Herod. 2, 10, 3.

Yet in the N. T. these verbs are not invariably connected with the obj. Acc.; many still vary, as in Greek authors, between a transitive and a neuter construction: *κλαίειν* with Acc. Matt. ii. 18 Sept., but *ἐπὶ τινα* Luke xix. 41; xxiii. 28; *πενθεῖν τινα* 2 Cor. xii. 21, but *ἐπὶ τινι* Rev. xviii. 11; *κόπτεσθαι τινα* Luke viii. 52
 209 (Eurip. Troad. 628; 1 Macc. ii. 70) and *ἐπὶ τινα* Rev. i. 7; xviii. 9;
 7th ed. *εὐδοκεῖν τινα* Heb. x. 6, 8 Sept. (Lev. xxvi. 34; Ps. li. 18), usually
ἐν τινι. Ὀμνύειν is mostly treated as neuter, and construed with
κατά τινος, Heb. vi. 13, 16 (Amos viii. 14; Zeph. i. 5; Isa. xlv. 23;
 236 Schaef. Long. p. 353) or *ἐν τινι* Matt. v. 34 ff.; Rev. x. 6 (Jer. v. 2, 7; Ps. lxxiii. 12). But in 2 Cor. i. 11 *εὐχαρ. (τινί) τι* occurs for
εὐχαριστεῖν (τινι) ἐπὶ τινι (in a Passive acceptation); and in 2 Cor. ix. 2; xi. 30 we find *καυχᾶσθαι* with the Acc. of the thing.

With Jude 15 *τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν (ᾧ) ἡσέβησαν* compare Zeph. iii. 11 *τῶν ἐπιτηδεύματων σου ὧν ἡσέβησας εἰς ἐμέ (ἀσεβεῖν τι* Plato, legg. 12, 941 a. is of another description, Mtth. 923).

Ἰερουργεῖν, ἐργάζεσθαι and ἐμπορεύεσθαι are real transitives, and as *ἱερ.*

θυσίαν is a proper expression (Palaeph. 5, 3 cf. Acta apocr. 113), so *ἱερ. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* Rom. xv. 16 in a figurative sense, is quite correct. Ἐμπορεύεσθαι has not only an Acc. of the merchandise but an Acc. of a person, *ἐμπ. τινα* Ezek. xxvii. 21; this in 2 Pet. ii. 3 means: *make merchandise (gain) of you*. Lastly, with Rev. xviii. 17 *οἱ τὴν θάλασσαν ἐργάζονται* compare Appian. Pun. 2; Boisson. Philostr. p. 452. Similar is *γῆν ἐργάζ.* Paus. 6, 10, 1.

Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (of Christian preaching) is employed in the N. T. quite like a transitive with the Acc. of a person; as, Luke iii. 18; Acts viii. 25; xiv. 21; compare especially *εὐαγγ. τινά τι* Acts xiii. 32. Yet *εὐαγγ. τινι* also occurs Luke iv. 18; Rom. i. 15; Gal. iv. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 6.

Βασκαίνειν *fascinare* also is construed with the Acc. Gal. iii. 1. In the signification *invidere* it has the Dat. (Philostr. epp. 13) Lob. 463. Yet the ancient grammarians are not agreed among themselves on the distinction between the constructions, see Wetsten. II. 221 sq. Παραινέιν, which in Gr. writers usually governs the Dat. of a person (Aesch. dial. 2, 13; Pol. 5, 4, 7), has the Acc. in Acts xxvii. 22. On the other hand, we find in Rev. ii. 14 *διδάσκειν τινί* (var.), as in some later writers; see Schaefer. Plut. V. 22.

Φυλάσσεσθαι, *to beware of*, likewise governs the Acc. in Acts xxi. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 15 (as frequently in Greek authors, Xen. M. 2, 2, 14; Lucian. asin. 4; D. S. 20, 26), as if *to observe, keep a watch on, some one for one's self*; on the other hand, in Luke xii. 15 *ἀπό* follows it — a construction not unknown also to the Greeks (Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9).

In a similar way, φοβέσθαι *to be afraid in reference to something, to 200 fear something (for one's self)* is usually construed with the Acc., but ^{6th ed.} sometimes has *ἀπό* (*to be afraid of, sibi ab al. timere*); as, Matt. x. 28 *μὴ φοβέσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενόντων τὸ σῶμα ... φοβηθῆτε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον*, etc. Greek authors say *φοβ. ὑπό τινος* or *τινι* (yet compare φόβος *ἀπό τινος* Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 53; 6, 3, 27). Φοβεῖσθαι *ἀπό* is an imitation of the Hebrew *יָרָא* (or *יִירָא*) *יָרָא* (Jer. i. 8). According to this analogy are construed also βλέπειν *ἀπό* (praegnanter) Mark viii. 15; xii. 38, and *προσέχειν ἀπό* Matt. xvi. 6. On the other hand, Phil. iii. 2 βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν etc. *observe, keep your eye on* (βλέπειν τι as signifying *to beware of*, could receive no confirmation from φυλάσσεσθαι τι, since the Mid. voice here is ²¹⁰ essential). *To beware* is here but a derivative meaning. ^{7th ed.} ²³⁷

Φεύγειν governs the Acc. in a figurative sense in 1 Cor. vi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 22 (*to flee a vice, i.e. to shun*); but once it has *ἀπό*, 1 Cor. x. 14 *φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας*. This last construction is otherwise very usual in the N. T. (as in the Sept.), and *φεύγειν ἀπό τινος* means either *to flee from one* in various senses (Jno. x. 5; Rev. ix. 6; Mark xiv. 52; Jas. iv. 7), or (including the result of fleeing) *to escape* Matt. xxiii. 33. In Greek authors, *φεύγειν ἀπό* occurs only in a strictly local sense, Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 4; Mem. 2, 6, 31; Plato, Phaed. 62 d.; Pol. 26, 5, 2.

On *χρησθαί τι* see § 31, 1, i. p. 209 sq.

The Acc. of *the place to which*, after verbs of motion, was confined in the classics, after the full use of prepositions had been introduced, mostly to poetry (Mtth. 747). From the character of the language of the N. T., one would expect only a preposition in such a case. Even Acts xxvii. 2 μέλλοντι πλεῖν τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους (where, however, in several good Codd. [Sin. also] εἰς is inserted) forms no exception; it must be rendered: *sail the places along the Asiatic coast*. In this signification πλεῖν is used by the best authors (as a strictly transitive verb) with the Acc. (also of places on the coast),¹ cf. Poppo, Thuc. 6, 36:

2. Neuter verbs expressing a feeling or act, frequently take an Acc. of a noun which is either from the same root or from one of kindred signification. Such nouns, inasmuch as they merely denote substantively the notion of the verb, are virtually implied in it. They are never annexed, except when the meaning of the verb has to be extended (Hm. Soph. Philoct. 281; Eurip. Androm. 220 sq.; Krü. 16 f.) either by an (Objective) Genitive, as 1 Pet. iii. 14 τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε (Isa. viii. 12), Col. ii. 19 αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ (Plat. legg. 10, 910 d. ἄσεβειν ἀνδρῶν ἀέβημα, 1 Macc. ii. 58 ζηλώσαι ζῆλον νόμου, Judith ix. 4); or by means of an Adjective, as Matt. ii. 10 ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα, Jno. vii. 24 τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνετε, 1 Tim. i. 18 ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν
 201 καλὴν στρατείαν (Plutarch. Pomp. 41), Mark iv. 41 ἐφοβήθησαν
 6th ed. φόβον μέγαν, 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7; Rev. xvii. 6; 1 Pet. iii. 6 (LXX. Gen. xxvii. 33; Zech. i. 15; Jon. i. 10; iv. 1, 6; Wisd. ix. 3). This, too, is very common in Greek authors, see Fischer, Well. III. I. 422 sq.; Bhd. 106 f.; Ast, Plat. Polit. 316; Weber, Dem. 471,
 238 especially Lob. Paralip. 501 sqq. (Mtth. 744 f., 910 f., 941) cf. Plato, Protag. 360 b. αἰσχροὺς φόβους φοβοῦνται, Xen. M. 1, 5, 6 δουλεύειν
 211 δουλείαν οὐδεμῶς ἤττον αἰσχροῖν, Her. 5, 119 μάχην ἐμαχέσαντο
 7th ed. ἰσχυρὴν (magnam pugnavimus pugnam Terent. Adelph. 5, 3, 57) Plat. Apol. 28 b. τοιοῦτον ἐπιτήδευμα ἐπιτηδεύσας, p. 36 c. εὐεργετεῖν τὴν μεγίστην εὐεργεσίαν, Alciph. 2, 3 δέχεται μου πάσας, δεήσεις Lysias 1; Theomnest. 27 πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἄλλους κινδύνους μεθ' ἑμῶν ἐκινδύνευσε (Plato, conv. 208 c.), Demosth. Neaer. 517 b.; ep. p. 121 b.; Aristot. polit. 3, 10; rhet. 2, 5, 4; Long. 4, 3; Aeschin. ep. 1, 121 b.; Lucian. asin. 11; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 32. Further see Georgi, Vind. 199 sqq.; Wetst. II. 321 (Gesen. Lg. 810). This

¹ Wahl's parallels from Xen. Hell. 4, 8, 6; Pol. 3, 4, 10 only confirm the phrase πλεῖν τὴν θάλασσαν, τὰ πελάγη, of which instances already existed in 1 Macc. xliii. 29; Ecclus. xliii. 24.

construction occurs with the passive in Rev. xvi. 9 ἐκαυματίσθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ μα μέγα (Plato, Euthyd. 275 c. ὠφέλειται τὴν μεγίστην ὠφέλειαν, Plutarch. Caes. 55 a.).

We find the same construction in a relative clause in Jno. xvii. 26 ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με, Eph. ii. 4; Mark x. 38 τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι.

From this must be distinguished the case in which the kindred noun denotes the objective result of the action, consequently a concrete idea, as διαθήκην διατίθεσθαι (Judg. ii. 2), μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν, πλοῦτον πλουτεῖν (Dan. xi. 2), ψήφισμα ψηφίζεσθαι, ἁμαρτάνειν ἁμαρτίαν (1 Jno. v. 16), meaning, make a covenant, bear a testimony, etc., Ewald, Gr. 595. For here the noun does not necessarily require the support of an adjective, etc. (as αἰσχρὰν ἁμαρτ. ἁμαρτάνειν Soph. Phil. 1249; Plato, Phaed. 113 e.; Lucian. Tim. 112; Dio Chr. 32, 361) cf. Eph. iv. 8 (Sept.) ὄχμα-λώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν (Judg. v. 12; 2 Chron. xxviii. 17; Demosth. Steph. 2, 621 b.). Yet constructions of this sort occur, for the most part, only through the interposition of a relative clause; as, Jno. v. 32 ἡ μαρτυρία, ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ, 1 Jno. v. 10; Heb. viii. 10 αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσομαι (x. 16, but viii. 9 διαθήκην ποιεῖν), Acts iii. 25; Luke i. 73; 1 Jno. ii. 25; Mark iii. 28; cf. Isocr. Aegin. 936; Lucian. paras. 5. That such Hebrew and Greek expressions, however, possess greater fulness and vividness than our general phrases, *make a covenant*, *bear testimony*, there can be no doubt.

Finally, to be separated altogether from the preceding combinations are those in which the substantive denotes something objective and material which exists independently of the action of the verb; as, φυλάσσειν φυλακὰς (posts) Xen. A. 2, 6, 10; φόρον φέρειν Aristoph. av. 191; Aristot. pol. 2, 8; Lucian. paras. 43. Compare from the N. T. Luke ii. 8 φυλάσσοντες φυλακὰς τῆς νυκτός, viii. 5 τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ, Matt. xiii. 30 δῆσατε δεσμὰς πρὸς τὸ 239 κατακαῦσαι *bind bundles*, Matt. vii. 24 ὅστις ῥυκοδόμησεν τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, Luke vi. 48 cf. also 1 Pet. iv. 2 (ἀκοὴν ἀκούειν Obad. 1). In these cases sometimes no different expression can be used (cf. ἀπο- 202 στόλους ἀποστέλλειν, legatos legare Cic. Vatin. 15, γράμματα γρά- 6th ed. φειν Dem. Polycl. 710 b.), and the connection of the noun and the verb is purely etymological and historical. On the whole phrase- 212 ology under this head, which is far more diversified in classic 7th ed. Greek, see Wunder on Lobeck's Sophocl. Aj. S. 37 ff.

Akin to this construction is ὄρκον ὀμνῖναι Luke i. 73 (Demosth. Apat. 579 c.), βιοῖν χρόνον 1 Pet. iv. 2 (ζῆν βίον D. S. exc. Vat. p. 49), δέρειν (πληγὺς) πολλάς, ὀλίγας, which further takes an Acc. of a person (cf. Luke xii. 47). Cf. Wunder, as above, 86. On Luke ii. 44 ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὁδὸν *they went a day's journey*, or Acts viii. 39 ἐπορεύετο τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ (cf. ὁδὸν βαδίζειν Plut. Coriol. 9; LXX. 1 Sam. vi. 9; Num. xxi. 33; Exod. xiii. 17), scarcely any remark is necessary; yet see Wunder, 41 f.

Analogous is the construction with the Dative; as, φωνεῖν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Acts xvi. 28, and βοᾶν or κράζειν φωνῇ μεγ. Mark xv. 34; Matt. xxvii. 50; Acts vii. 60, ὄρκω ὀμνῖναι Acts ii. 30, χαρᾷ χαίρειν 1 Thess. iii. 9 (ἀγαλλιάσθαι χαρᾷ ἀνεκκαλήτῃ 1 Pet. i. 8), κηρύσσειν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Rev. v. 2 [text. recept.]; also ποίῃ θανάτῃ ἡμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν Jno. xii. 33; xviii. 32. Cf. Aristot. pol. 3, 9; Plut. Coriol. 3 (Jonah i. 16; Acta apocr. 4) Krii. 17 (Bengel, Apoc. xviii. 2) cf. § 54, 3, p. 466.

3. Instead of the Accusative of the object, in many cases a preposition, ἐν (א), is said to be used, according to the Hebrew construction; but the passages adduced, when more closely examined, soon show the admissibility of the preposition in its proper import:

a. In Acts xv. 7 ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη etc., א רַבִּי is not to be referred to, but ἐν ἡμῖν signifies *among us* (the Apostles); for, in the first place, the singular μου is immediately used of Peter, and again, notice is to be taken of τὰ ἔθνη (as the apostolic field of labor): God made choice among us, that the heathen should be instructed through me. See also Olshausen in loc. On the Hebrew א רַבִּי, which in the Sept. is sometimes rendered ἐκλέγ. ἐν (1 Sam. xvi. 9; 1 Kings viii. 16; 1 Chron. xxviii. 4; Neh. ix. 7), but which Gesenius has not even deemed it necessary to explain, see Ewald, Gr. 605.

b. Ὁμολογεῖν ἐν Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8 *to make confession in one*, i.e. (according to another construction) *about one*. Bengel otherwise. The Hebrew expression בְּ הַיָּהוּה Ps. xxxii. 5 has not quite the same meaning.

4. Two Accusatives are used,

- 240 a. One of a person and the other of a thing (Mtth. 930, 932), uniformly after verbs of *clothing* and *unclothing* Jno. xix. 2; Matt. xxvii. 28, 31; Mark xv. 17; Rev. xvii. 4, of (feeding and) *giving to drink* Mark ix. 41; 1 Cor. iii. 2,¹ of *anointing* Rev. iii. 18 (Heb. i. 9), of *loading* Luke xi. 46, of *adjuring* (by) Acts xix. 13; 1 Thess. v. 27, of *reminding* (ἀναμνησκειν) 1 Cor. iv. 17 (Xen. C. 3, 3,

¹ To this class belongs also ψωμίζειν Num. xi. 4; Deut. viii. 16; Wisd. xvi. 20, for which we find in Jambl. Pyth. 13 ψωμίζειν τινὰ τινι. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. xiii. 3 ψωμίζειν πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα means *to feed out all my goods, bestow in food*.

37; Her. 6, 140; but *ἀναμν. τινά τινος* Xen. C. 6, 4, 13), of *teaching* Jno. xiv. 26, of *asking* and *inquiring* Matt. vii. 9; Jno. xvi. 23; 203 1 Pet. iii. 15 (*αἰτεῖν*), Matt. xxi. 24 (Lob. Paralip. 522), Mark iv. 10 ^{6th ed.} (*ἐρωτᾶν*). On the other hand, *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* is construed only ²¹³ ^{7th ed.} in Acts xiii. 32 with two Accusatives, cf. Heliod. 2, 10; Alciph. 3, 12; Euseb. H. E. 3, 4, var. For *κρύπτειν τινά τι* (Mtth. 937) the construction *κρύπτειν τι ἀπό τινος* is invariably used, Col. i. 26; Luke xviii. 34; xix. 42, or at least indicated. *Διδάσκειν* is once joined, but according to a somewhat uncertain reading, to *ἐν τινι* of the person, Rev. ii. 14 (as if *instructing at a person*).¹ Other and better Codd. have *ἐδίδασκε τῷ Βαλάκ*, cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 656 (ⲓ ⲡⲉⲓ Job xxi. 22). Besides *αἰτεῖν τινά τι*, we find *αἰτεῖν τι παρά* or *ἀπό τινος* Acts iii. 2; ix. 2; Matt. xx. 20 (Xen. A. 1, 3, 16). Further, *χρίειν τινά* with the Dative of the material occurs Acts x. 38, as *ἀλείφειν* uniformly, Mark vi. 13; Jno. xi. 2, etc.; *ὑπομνήσκειν τινὰ περί τινος* 2 Pet. i. 12, also *περιβάλλεσθαι ἐν* Rev. iii. 5; iv. 4, *ἡμφιεσμένος ἐν* Matt. xi. 8; Luke vii. 25 (Dat. in Plat. Protag. 321 a.). For *ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τινά τι* we find *ἀφαιρ. τι ἀπό τινος* Luke xvi. 3.

Heb. ii. 17 *ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας* (cf. Ecclus. xxviii. 5; Dan. ix. 24 Theodot.) *expiare peccata* is perhaps to be explained by supposing that the expression *ἰλάσκεσθαι τὸν θεὸν τὰς ἁμαρτίας* had begun to be used. In 1 Sam. iii. 14 *ἐξίλασθήσεται ἀδικία οἴκου Ἑλὶ*, the verb is strictly passive.

The same view essentially may be taken (Mtth. 927, 939; Rost 497 f. 503) of the Accusative of a pronoun (*τί τὸ αὐτό, πάντα*) or neuter adjective (*μέγα*, etc.), which is joined to many verbs along with the Acc. or Gen. of a person (as, *βλάπτειν* Luke iv. 35, *ὠφελεῖν* Gal. v. 2 cf. Lucian. Tim. 119, 241 *ἀδικεῖν* Acts xxv. 10; Gal. iv. 12; Philem. 18, *μνησθῆναι* 1 Cor. xi. 2); there is however this difference, that in these instances the use of two Accusatives was arrested, as it were, in the first stage. So we Germans say: *jem. etwas, viel* u. s. w. *fragen*, but not on this account: *jem. eine Nachricht fragen*. Hither I refer also Matt. xxvii. 44. Instances of intransitive verbs which are construed with such Accusatives of a thing and have thus become (to a limited extent) transitives, it is scarcely necessary to adduce; yet see 1 Cor. ix. 25 *πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται*, xi. 2; Phil. i. 6; ii. 18; 2 Cor. vii. 14 (cf., however, 1 above) Matt. ix. 14; Rev. v. 4, etc. Fr. explains in the same way also Rom. vi. 10 *ὁ ἀπέθανεν* and Gal. ii. 20 *ὁ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί*, see above, § 24, note 3, p. 168.

¹ This construction cannot be certainly established in reference to the Hebrew by 2 Chron. xvii. 9, *לְלַמֵּד בְּיָדָם* as this probably means *teach in Judah*. In Acts vii. 22 *ἐπαυθεῖσθαι πάσῃ σοφίᾳ* is not put for *πάσων σοφίαν* (cf. Diod. S. 1, 91); but the Dative is employed to denote the means of training, whereas *ἐταυθ. πάσων σοφίαν* would be *edoctus est* (institutus ad) *sapientiam*. The true reading of the passage, however, is probably *ἐν π. σοφίᾳ*, cf. Plat. Crito 50 d.

b. An Acc. of the Subject and of the Predicate (Mtth. 934 f.); as, Jno. vi. 15 *ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλέα*, Luke xix. 46 *ὁμοίως αὐτὸν (οἶκον) ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον ληστῶν*, Heb. i. 2 *ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον* (i. 13), Jas. v. 10 *ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε τῆς κακοπαθείας . . . τοῖς 214 προφήταις*, Heb. xii. 9 *τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς πατέρας εἵχομεν παιδευτάς*,
 7th ed. Phil. iii. 7 *ταῦτα (κέρδη) ἡγῆμαι ζημίαν*, 2 Pet iii. 15 *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγείσθε*, Luke i. 59 *ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ . . . Ζαχαρίαν*, vs. 53 (Pol. 15, 2, 4). So, in particular, with verbs of
 204 *making, naming* (appointing), *constituting, viewing* as, etc., Matt.
 6th ed. iv. 19; xxii. 43; Jno. v. 11; x. 33; xix. 7; Acts v. 31; vii. 10; xx. 28; Luke xii. 14; Rom. iii. 25; vi. 11; viii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 9; ix. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Eph. ii. 14; Phil. ii. 29; Tit. ii. 7; Heb. vii. 28; xi. 26; Jas. ii. 5; Rev. xxi. 5; 2 Sam. ii. 5, 13; iii. 15.

The Acc. of the Predicate (of destination) is, however, sometimes annexed with the preposition *εἰς*, — Acts xiii. 22 *ἤγαγεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δαυὶδ εἰς βασιλέα*, vii. 21 *ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἐαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν*, *for, as, a son*,¹ xiii. 47 (cf. also the Passive *λογίζεσθαι εἰς τι* Acts xix. 27; Rom. ii. 26; ix. 8, § 29, 3. Note), — or with *ὡς*, as 2 Thess. iii. 15 *καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν (τοῦτον 14) ἡγείσθε* (π. 277). This is a Hebraistic construction (Ewald, Gr. 603), and is frequently imitated in the Sept., Isa. xlix. 6; 2 Kings iv. 1; Judith iii. 8; v. 11; Gen. xii. 2; xliii. 17; 1 Sam. xv. 11; Esth. ii. 7; iv. 4. What has been adduced from classic Greek as parallel to the construction with *εἰς* is different from it, as the *εἰς* of destination in Her. 1, 34 *πάντες τοῖσι χρέονται ἐς πόλεμον*, or Eurip. Troad. 1201 *οὐ γὰρ εἰς κάλλος τύχας δαίμων δίδωσι*, or Alciph. 3, 28. On the other hand, real parallels occur in later writers, e.g. Niceph. Constant. p. 51, ed. Bonn.: *ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἅπας δῆμος . . . ἀναγορεύουσιν εἰς βασιλέα*
 242 *Ἀρτέμιον*, p. 18 *εἰς γυναῖκα δίδωμί σοι αὐτήν*, Geo. Pachym. I. 349 *τὴν ἐκείνου ἔκγονον λαβὼν εἰς γυναῖκα*, Theophan. contin. p. 223 *κεχρισμένος εἰς βασιλέα*. See, in general, the Index to Pachym., Leo Grammat. and Theophan. in the Bonn edition; Acta apocr. p. 71. To the latter mode of expression may also be referred Heb. xi. 8 *λαμβάν. εἰς κληρονομίαν*, and perhaps Acts vii. 53 *ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων* *ye received the law for ordinances of angels*, i.e. as ordinances of angels, see Bengel in loc.; yet *εἰς* here may be more easily explained by Matt. xii. 41. In Phil. iv. 16, however, the construction *εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν μοι ἐπέμψατε* is obviously a different thought from *τὴν χρεῖαν μ. ἐπ.*, and so does not belong here.

¹ On the other hand, cf. Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 24 *πῶλους εἰς δασμὸν βασιλεῖ τρεφομένους*, whereas Arrian, Alex. 1, 26, 5 *τοὺς ἵππους, οὓς δασμὸν βασιλεῖ ἔτρεφεν*, see Ellendt, in loc.

Essentially the same as the preceding constructions are Luke ix. 14 κατακλίνετε αὐτοὺς κλισίας ἀνὰ πενήκοντα (in rows of 50), Mark vi. 39 ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλίνειν πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια (in separate parties). These Accusatives are most simply understood as predicative. See § 59.

5. Verbs which in the Active voice govern the Acc. both of a person and of a thing, retain as is well known the latter in the Passive; 215 as, 2 Thess. ii. 15 παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε, Luke xvi. 19 ἐνεδιδύ-^{7th ed.}σκετο πορφύραν, Heb. vi. 9; cf. Phil. iii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 13 (without εἰς!). So also in the constructions considered under 2: Luke xii. 48 δαρήσεται ὀλίγας (cf. δέρειν τινὰ πληγὰς), Mark x. 38 τὸ βάπτισμα, δ' ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι, Rev. xvi. 9 (cf. Lucian. Tox. 61; Dion. Hal. IV. 2162, 8). On the other hand, the *Predicative* Acc. passes over into a Nominative: Heb. v. 10 προσαγορευθεὶς 205 . . . ἄρχιερεύς, Matt. v. 9 αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται, Jas. iv. 4^{6th ed.} ἐχθρὸς θεοῦ καθίσταται.

Further, the Accusative of the thing is retained by such verbs as, in the Active, govern a *Dative* of the person along with the Accusative of a thing,—they being treated when put in the Passive altogether like causal verbs; as, Gal. ii. 7 πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (from πιστεύω τινί τι, in the Passive πιστεύομαι τι), 1 Cor. ix. 17; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 11; ¹ see Fischer, Well. III. I. 437; Mtth. 946. The same analogy is followed by περικεῖμαι Acts xxviii. 20 τὴν ἄλυσιν ταύτην περικεῖμαι (from ἄλυσιν περικεῖται μοι) Heb. v. 2 (d'Orvill. Charit. p. 240; Mtth. 947). Accordingly, in general, the Accusative with Passives indicates the more remote object, particularly that part of the Subject where the quality denoted by the verb resides; as, 1 Tim. vi. 5 διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν (as if from διαφθεῖρ. τινὲ τὸν νοῦν), 2 Tim. iii. 8; Jno. xi. 44 δεδεμένος τοὺς 243 πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας, Phil. i. 11 πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσ., 2 Cor. iii. 18 τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα, Heb. x. 22 f. on which cf. Valcken. ad Herod. 7, 39; Hartung, Casus 61.

Whether Matt. xi. 5 πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, Heb. iv. 2 ἐσμὲν εὐηγγελισμένοι (verse 6) cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 31; Joel ii. 32 also come under this rule or should be referred to εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τινά τι, remains doubtful; yet see § 39, 1.

6. The Accusative employed to denote a material object only in a mediate or remote way was by degrees more and more extended, and gave rise to elliptical constructions of various sorts, which we must resolve by prepositions and the like. This phraseology is but slightly used in the N. T. It is mainly in specifications of

¹ On the other hand, e.g. 1 Cor. xiv. 34 οὐκ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, Acts xxvi. 1.

time and place that the Acc. as an Objective case is still perceptible to us; as, Luke xxii. 41 ἀπεσπάρσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὥσεί λίθου βολήν he withdrew from them a stone's cast (as if by his withdrawing he made the distance of a stone's cast), Jno. vi. 19 ἐηλεκότες ὡς σταδίου εἴκοσι πέντε (Mtth. 950), 1 Pet. iv. 2 τὸν ἐπὶλοιπὸν ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον, Jno. ii. 12 ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας, Luke i. 75; ii. 41; xv. 29; xx. 9; Jno. i. 40; v. 5; xi. 6; Matt. ix. 20; Acts xiii. 21; Heb. xi. 23; iii. 17; Mdv. 33 f. The Acc. is thus in the N. T. commonly employed to denote the *duration* of time (but in Jno. v. 5 ἔτη is governed by ἔχων, see Mey.); sometimes also the 216 (approximate) *point* of time, as Jno. iv. 52 ἐχθὲς ὥραν ἐβδόμην 7th ed. ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός, Acts x. 3; Rev. iii. 3 (where more frequently περὶ with the Acc. is used) Krü. 13 f.

When the Acc., annexed as a detached word or phrase to other words, gives a closer specification as respects sort, number, degree, sphere—as Jno. vi. 10 ἀνέπεσαν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὥσεί πεντακισχίλιοι (*in number*), cf. Isocr. big. 842; Aristot. pol. 2, 8; Ptol. 4, 6, 34 (many others in Lob. Phryn. p. 364 sq. and Paralip. 528), Jude 7 τὸν ὅμοιον τούτοις τρόπον ἐκπορνεύσασαι, Matt. xxiii. 37 ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει, 2 Tim. iii. 8 (Plat. rep. 7, 517 c.; 206 Plut. educ. 4, 4; 9, 18), Acts xviii. 3 σκηνοποιοὺς τὴν τέχνην (Lucian. 6th ed. asin. 43; Agath. 2, 46; Acta apocr. p. 61)—it resembles most nearly the Passive construction under 5.¹ This accusative, however, is very rare in the N. T.; even in Acts xviii. 3 the best Codd. [Sin. also] have τῇ τέχνῃ, cf. § 31. On the other hand, a number of strictly adverbial Accusatives, which were probably very current in the language of conversation, have found their way into the 244 N. T.; as, μακρὰν (*afar*), μάτην (*in cassum*), ἀκμήν (*this moment*) yet, τὴν ἀρχὴν (Jno. viii. 25), δωρεάν, τὸ τέλος (1 Pet. iii. 8), cf. § 54, 1. See, in general, Hm. Vig. p. 882 sq. To the same class of constructions belong also parenthetical phrases, such as Rom. xii. 18 εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες, ix. 5 (i. 15) Heb. ii. 17; v. 1; Rom. xv. 17; Mtth. 734; Mdv. 36 f.

How the Acc. of quality coincides with the Dative has already been noticed. Thus τῷ ἀριθμῷ is used for τὸν ἀριθμὸν. Usually, however, we find the Acc. in classic Greek where in the N. T. the Dative is employed; e.g. τὸ γένος (*natione*) Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 2; Herod. 1, 8, 2; D. S. 1, 4; Arrian. Al. 1, 27, 8 and τῷ γένει Mark vii. 26; Acts iv. 36 (Palaeoph. 6, 2; 11, 2), ἐκλύεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ Heb. xii. 3 and τὴν ψυχὴν Diod. S. 20, 1, βραδεὺς τῇ καρδίᾳ Luke xxiv. 25, but βραδὺς τὸν νοῦν Dion. H. de Lys. p. 243 Lips.

¹ On the Hebrew cf. Ewald 591 f.

See Krü. 15; Lob. Paralip. 528 (Wetst. N. T. I. 826). In Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 b. we find *θρασὺς τῷ βίῳ* and *μὴ πολίτης τὴν φύσιν* side by side. For *τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον* even Greek prose authors more frequently employ *κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον*.

Very extraordinary is the expression *ὁδὸν θαλάσσης* in Matt. iv. 15 (from Isaiah) which is rendered *by the way*. Passages such as 1 Sam. vi. 9 *εἰ ὁδὸν ὁρίων αὐτῆς πορεύσεται* (Wunder on Lob. Sophocl. Aj. 41 f.) Num. xxi. 33; Exod. xiii. 17 (cf. Luke ii. 44), do not authenticate that Acc. without government (by a verb), in an address containing Vocatives. Such a construction would quite exceed the limits of prose composition (Bhdy. 114 f.). What Thiersch p. 145 sq. remarks, is not decisive. Should we perhaps read *οἱ ὁδὸν θαλάσσης (οἰκοῦντες)*, with the Sept.? It is difficult to maintain with Mey. that *εἶδε* in verse 16 is the governing verb. The topographical difficulties of the usual interpretation are not invincible; only we must not, as in the prophet, take *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* as an in-²¹⁷ dependent clause, as that would not apply to this passage in Matthew. ^{7th ed.}

7. In some passages the Accusative is said to be used absolutely, when on closer examination the grammatical reason for the Acc. can be discovered in the structure of the sentence. Thus in Rom. viii. 3 *τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου . . . ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας . . . κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* is properly equivalent to *τὸ ἀδύν. τοῦ νόμου ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, πέμψας . . . καὶ κατακρίνων* etc. (where *ἀδύνατον* does not require to be taken in a passive sense); this, however, may also be a Nominative put at the commencement (cf. Wisd. xvi. 17). In Acts xxvi. 3 the Acc. *γνώστην ὄντα* is undoubtedly to be explained as an anacoluthon, which, when ²⁰⁷ participles are annexed, is of frequent occurrence; see § 63, I. 2a. ^{6th ed.} Schwarz, de soloec. p. 94 sq., has adduced nothing altogether of the ²⁴⁵ same kind. In Luke xxiv. 46 f. *ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν . . . καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν . . . ἀρχάμενον ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ*, the Acc. (in the construction of the Acc. with the Infinitive) is in itself grammatically clear; only the reference of *ἀρχάμενον* is loose: *beginning* (viz. the *κηρύσσων*), or, impersonally, *that it should be begun*; cf. Her. 3, 91. See besides Kypke I. 344 sq. In Rev. i. 20 the Accs. depend on *γράφον* verse 19, as has long been admitted. Lastly, in Rev. xxi. 17 *ἐμέτρησε τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἑκατὸν τεσσαρ. πηχῶν, μέτρον ἀνθρώπου* etc., the last words are a loose apposition to the clause *ἐμέτρ. τὸ τεῖχος* etc.; cf. Mtth. 916. Further, cf. Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 501; Hartung, S. 54; Wannowski, Syntax. anom. p. 128 sqq. On an Acc. in apposition to a whole clause, as Rom. xii. 1, see § 59, 9.

33. CONNECTION OF A VERB (NEUTER) WITH ITS DEPENDENT NOUN BY MEANS OF PREPOSITIONS.

A considerable number of verbs, particularly such as denote an affection or a tendency of the mind, are connected with their predicate by means of a preposition. In this respect the diction of the N. T. sometimes accords with classic usage, and sometimes displays more of a Hebrew and Oriental tinge. We arrange the verbs in question as follows :

a. Verbs of *rejoicing* or *grieving*, which in Greek authors are frequently construed with the Dative alone (Fr. Rom. III. 78 sq.), take for the most part the preposition *ἐπί* with the Dat. (cf. Wurm, Dinarch. p. 40 sq.), as *χαίρειν* Matt. xviii. 13 ; Luke i. 14 ; Acts xv. 31 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 6 ; Rev. xi. 10 (cf. Xen. C. 8, 4, 12 ; D. S. 19, 55 ; Isocr. permut. 738 ; Arrian. Ind. 35, 8), *εὐφραίνεσθαι* Rev. xviii. 20 (Ecclus. xvi. 1 ; 1 Macc. xi. 44 ; Xen. conv. 7, 5), *συλλυπεῖσθαι* Mark iii. 5 (Xen. Mem. 3, 9, 8 ; cf. *χαλεπῶς φέρειν ἐπὶ τινι* Xen. H. 7, 4, 21) ; but sometimes also *ἐν* (*λυπεῖν ἐν* Jacobs, 7th ed. Achill. Tat. p. 814), as *χαίρειν* Luke x. 20 ; Phil. i. 18 (Col. i. 24. cf. Soph. Trach. 1119), *εὐφραίνεσθαι* Acts vii. 41, *ἀγαλλιάσθαι* 1 Pet. i. 6 (but *ἀγάλλεσθαι ἐπὶ* Xen. Mem. 2, 6, 35 ; 3, 5, 16).

Of verbs of *being angry*, *ἀγανακτεῖν* is construed with *περί* (to be 246 *angry on account of* some one) Matt. xx. 24 ; Mark x. 41 ; but (like *ἀγανακτεῖν ἐπὶ* Lucian. abdic. 9 ; Aphthon. progymn. c. 9 p. 267) *ὀργίζεσθαι ἐπὶ τινι* Rev. xii. 17 ; cf. Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 9, 8 (in the Sept. even *ὀργίζεσθαι ἐν τινι* Judg. ii. 14, in later Greek writers *ὀργίζεσθαι κατὰ τινος* as Malal. p. 43, 102, 165, etc.). The opposite, *εὐδοκεῖν*, is construed, in imitation of the Hebrew *אֲשׁוּרָה* and after the example of the Sept., with *ἐν* (to have pleasure *in*), whether used in reference to persons Matt. iii. 17 ; Luke iii. 22 ; 1 Cor. x. 5 or things 2 Cor. xii. 10 ; 2 Thess. ii. 12 (*θέλει ἐν* Col. ii. 18 cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 22 ?) ; in classic Greek the Dative alone would be sufficient. 208 *Ἀρκεῖσθαι*, which usually takes a Dative (Luke iii. 14 ; Heb. xiii. 5), 6th ed. is once, 3 Jno. 10, construed with *ἐπὶ*.

b. Verbs denoting *wonder*, *amazement*, take *ἐπὶ* with the Dative ; so *θαυμάζειν* Mark xii. 17 ; Luke xx. 26, *ἐκπλήσσεσθαι* Matt. xxii. 33 ; Mark i. 22 ; xi. 18 ; Luke iv. 32 ; Acts xiii. 12, which is also very common in Greek authors. *Θαυμάζειν περί τινος* Luke ii. 18 (Isaeus 3, 28 cf. Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 244) or even *διὰ τι* *on account of something* Mark vi. 6, as Aelian. 12, 6 ; 14, 36 *θαυμάζειν τινὰ διὰ τι*. But *θαυμάζειν ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν* Luke i. 21 may mean

during his tarrying; yet cf. Sir. xi. 21. On *ξενίζεσθαι τινι* see above, § 31, 1, f. p. 209.

c. Of verbs signifying *to pity*, *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* usually takes *ἐπὶ* either with the Acc., Matt. xv. 32; Mark vi. 34; viii. 2; ix. 22, or with the Dat., Luke vii. 13; Matt. xiv. 14, only once Matt. ix. 36 it takes *περὶ*; but *ἐλεείσθαι* is used as a transitive, see § 32, 1, b. a.

d. Verbs of *relying on*, *trusting*, *hoping*, *boasting*, are construed with *ἐπί*, *ἐν*, *εἰς*; as, *πέποιθα ἐπὶ τινι* Mark x. 24; Luke xi. 22; 2 Cor. i. 9 (Agath. 209, 5; 306, 20), *ἐπὶ τι* or *τινα* Matt. xxvii. 43; 2 Thess. iii. 4, with *ἐν* Phil. iii. 3; *πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τινι* Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 6 Sept. (on *πιστεύειν εἰς* or *ἐπὶ τινα* *believe on one*, see above, § 31, 5), *ἐλπίζειν ἐπὶ* with Dat. Rom. xv. 12; Phil. iv. 10 (Pol. 1, 82, 6) and with Acc. 1 Tim. v. 5; 1 Macc. ii. 61, *εἰς* Jno. v. 45; 2 Cor. i. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 5; Eccclus. ii. 9 (Herod. 7, 10, 1; Joseph. bell. jud. 6, 2, 1, ἡ εἰς τινα *ἐλπὶς* Plut. Galba c. 19), *ἐν* 1 Cor. xv. 19 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 25; Mem. 4, 2, 28; Pol. 1, 59, 2 *ἐλπίδα ἔχειν ἐν τ.*), *καυχᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τινι* Rom. v. 2 (Ps. xlviii. 7; Eccclus. xxx. 2; D. S. 16, 70, similarly *σεμνύνεσθαι* Diog. L. 2, 71; Isocr. big. p. 840 and *φυσιοῦσθαι* Diog. L. 6, 24), more frequently *ἐν* Rom. ii. 17, 23; v. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 21; Gal. vi. 13 (Ps. cxlix. 5; Jer. ix. 23), but not *κατὰ* 2 Cor. xi. 18 see Mey. in loc., also not *ὑπέρ* 2 Cor. vii. 14 cf. ix. 2.

e. Of verbs of *sinning*, *offending against*, *ἀμαρτάνειν* is connected by *εἰς* with the object sinned *against*, Matt. xviii. 21; Luke xvii. 4; 219 1 Cor. vi. 18 etc., cf. Soph. Oed. C. 972; Her. 1, 138; Isocr. panath. 7th ed. p. 644; permut. p. 750 and Aegin. p. 920, 934; Mr. Anton. 7, 26; 247 Wetsten. I. 443; on the other hand, *ἀμαρτάν. πρὸς τινα* Joseph. antt. 14, 15, 2, *περὶ τινα* Isocr. permut. 754 (*ἀμαρτ. τινί* 1 Sam. xiv. 33; 1 Kings viii. 31, 33; Judg. x. 10).

f. The verbs *ἀρέσκειν* *please*, and *φανῆναι* *appear* (so and so), instead of the Dative of the person to whom something gives pleasure or appears (in such or such a light), are connected with the noun by the Hellenistic preposition *ἐνώπιον*; as, Acts vi. 5 *ἤρρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους* (Deut. i. 23), Luke xxiv. 11 *ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα*. In the Sept. *ἀρέσκειν* occurs also with *ἐναντίον* *τινός* Num. xxxvi. 6; Gen. xxxiv. 18; 1 Macc. vi. 60.

g. Of verbs of *seeing*, *βλέπειν* is often construed with *εἰς* (*intueri*) Jno. xiii. 22; Acts iii. 4, which is not unknown to classic Greek also; see Wahl.

There is properly speaking a redundancy when verbs of *following* are

construed with the preposition *μετά* or *σύν* (cf. *comitari cum aliquo* in Latin 209 inscriptions), Rev. vi. 8; xiv. 13; see Wetst. N. T. I. 717; Lob. Phryn. 6th ed. p. 354; Schaef. Dem. V. 590; Hm. Lucian. p. 178; Krü. 63. The phrase *ἀκολουθῶ ὁπίσω τινός* (ἡγήξ) Matt. x. 38 (Isa. xlv. 14) is Hebraistic.

Substantives derived from such verbs are in the same way connected with the object by means of prepositions; as, *πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ* Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 15 etc., *παρουσία πρὸς ὑμᾶς* Phil. i. 26, *θλίψεις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* Eph. iii. 13, *ζῆλος ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ* 2 Cor. vii. 7, see Fr. Rom. I. 195, 365 sq.

§ 34. ADJECTIVES.

1. Although the two sorts of nouns, substantive and adjective, are distinct from each other in thought, yet the latter (including participles) enter the sphere of substantives far more abundantly in Greek than, for instance, in Latin. This they do whether they have or have not the Article, and in every gender; sometimes owing to an original ellipsis, and sometimes without an ellipsis, 248 by virtue of the Gender, whether masculine or neuter, peculiar to them (Krü. 2 f.); as, *ἡ ἔρημος* (γῆ), *τῇ ἐπιούσῃ* (ἡμέρᾳ), *διοπετές* (ἄγαλμα) Acts xix. 35, *τὸ σηρικόν* (ὑφασμα?) Rev. xviii. 12, *ὁ σαφός*, *ὁ κλέπτων* Eph. iv. 28, *βασιλικός*, *ὁ ἄρχων*, *ἀλλότριοι* *strangers*, *κακοποιοί* *evil-doers*, *τὸ ἀγαθόν* (τὸ πνευματικόν, ψυχικόν 1 Cor. xv. 46?).

On adjectives which have become substantives by an ellipsis, see § 64. Among expressions relating to persons, as *σοφός*, *οἱ σοφοί*, the following are characteristic of the N. T.: *ὁ πιστός* *the believer*, *πιστοί* *believers*, *ἄγιοι*, *ἐκλεκτοί*, *ἀμαρτωλοί* Rom. xv. 31; xvi. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 15; 1 Tim. i. 15; v. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Heb. xii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 22; so even with an attributive Adjective, Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2 *κλητοὶς ἁγίοις*, or with a 220 Gen. Rom. viii. 33 *ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ*. In all these cases persons are indicated 7th ed. to whom the quality in question belongs; and there is no necessity for supplying *ἄνθρωποι* (or *ἀδελφοί*). Likewise where *ὁ ἀληθινός* 1 Jno. v. 20 is used of God, or *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ* Luke iv. 34 of Christ, or *ὁ πονηρός* of the devil, there is no ellipsis of those substantives, but the notion is grammatically complete: *the True, the Holy One of God*; and what individual is distinctively so called in Biblical diction, must be ascertained from other sources.

2. Especially frequent and diversified are Neuters used substantively (Krü. 3). Many of these even regularly take the place of a substantive derivable (but not always actually existing) from the root; and this, not only in reference to things sensible, *μέσον*, *ἔσχατον*, *μικρόν*, *βραχύ*, *ὀλίγον*, *φανερόν*, *κρυπτόν*, *ἐλαττον*, *ἄρσεν*, etc., especially with a preposition (*εἰς τὸ μέσον* Mark iii. 3; Jno. xx. 19,

μετὰ μικρόν Matt. xxvi. 73, ἐν ὀλίγῳ Acts xxvi. 29, ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Matt. vi. 4, εἰς φανερόν Mark iv. 22), but also mental and abstract, particularly with a Gen. annexed, as Rom. ii. 4 τὸ χρηστὸν τ. θεοῦ (ἡ χρηστότης), Heb. vi. 17 τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς, Rom. viii. 3; ix. 22; 1 Cor. i. 25; 2 Cor. iv. 17; Phil. iii. 8 τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως, iv. 5 τὸ ἐπικεκῆς ὑμῶν. Instead of the Gen. another construction is selected in Rom. i. 15 τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον (τὸ πρόθυμον ²¹⁰ purpose Eur. Iphig. 983). The Plurals of adjectives are regularly ²¹¹ ed concretes, and denote whole classes of things (persons); as, τὰ ὁρατὰ κ. ἀόρατα Col. i. 16, ἐπουράνια and ἐπίγεια Jno. iii. 12; Phil. ii. 10, τὰ βαθέα Rev. ii. 24, ἀρχαῖα 2 Cor. v. 17. Such adjectives, moreover, sometimes are made more specific by the context: thus, ἐπουράνια Jno. as above heavenly *truths*, Phil. ii. 10 heavenly *beings*, Eph. ii. 6; iii. 10 heavenly *places* (i.e. οὐρανοί, cf. var. Eph. i. 20) etc. In Rom. i. 20 τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ the Plural refers to the partition that follows, ἡ τε αἰδῖος δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης, and Philippi has 249 explained the word more correctly than Fr. (On Eph. vi. 12 πνευματικά τῆς πονηρίας, see Note 3.)

The expression τὸ δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως in 1 Pet. i. 7 does not come under this head, as δοκίμιον of itself is a substantive, (no adjective δοκίμιος exists); further, compare on this passage and on Jas. i. 3, Fr. Präl. S. 44. In Rom. i. 19, too, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is not simply i.e. ἡ γνώσις τ. θ., otherwise it would not be easy to see why Paul did not employ ἡ γνώσις, so usual to him; but the meaning is either *what is known* (to mankind) *of God*, or *what is knowable* (may be known) *of* (about) *God*. (In reference to the latter meaning of γνωστός, which Thol. questioned, see Soph. Oed. R. 362; Hm. Plat. rep. 7, 517 b.; Arrian. Epict. 2, 20, 4, cf. Schulthess, theol. Annal. 1829, S. 976.) I prefer the former as the simpler. Paul is speaking of the *objective* knowledge, of the sum of that which is known of God (from what source see verse 20). This objective γνωστόν becomes *subjective*, in as far as φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς. This shows, too, why Paul did not use ἡ γνώσις here.

The preceding mode of expression, which flows quite simply from the 221 nature of the Neuter, is not unknown to the Greeks. The later prose ²¹² ed authors in particular adopted it from the technical language of philosophy. At the same time, the examples collected by Georgi (Hierocrit. I. 39) must be carefully sifted. The following may serve as unquestionable parallels: Demosth. Phil. 1. p. 20 a. τὸ τῶν θεῶν εὐμένες, and de fals. leg. p. 213 a. τὸ ἀσφαλὲς αὐτῆς, Thuc. 1, 68 τὸ πιστὸν τῆς πολιτείας, 2, 71 τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῆς γνώμης, Galen. protrept. 2 τὸ τῆς τέχνης ἀστατον and τὸ τῆς βάσεως εὐμετακύλιστον, Heliod. 2, 15, 83 τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς λύπης, Plat. Phaedr. 240 a.; Strabo 3, 168; Philostr. Ap. 7, 12; D. S. 19, 55; Diog.

L. 9, 63. This construction with the participle is especially characteristic of Thuc. (and the Byzantines). Cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 253; Niebuhr, ind. ad Dexipp. Eunap. and Malch. An abstract noun and neuter adjectives in connection occur in Plutarch, Agis 20 ἡ πολλὴ εὐλάβεια καὶ τὸ πρῶτον καὶ φιλόανθρωπον.

3. On the other hand, a notion which should naturally be expressed by an adjective as an epithet,¹ is sometimes, by a change of construction, brought out by a substantive. Yet the N. T. is by no means poor in adjectives; it can show a considerable number which do not occur in the (early) Greek authors, and some of which have been formed by the apostles themselves (ἐπιούσιος, σαρ-
211 κικός, πνευματικός, παρείσακτος, πύρινος, ἀκατάκριτος, ἀκρογωνιαίος, ἀνεπαίσχυντος, αὐτοκατάκριτος, ἀχειροποίητος, βρώσιμος, ἐπιπόθητος, εὐπερίστατος, ἰσάγγελος, κατείδωλος, κυριακός, ταπεινόφρων etc.).
250

This substitution of a substantive for an adjective takes place,

a. In such a way that the substantive which is the *principal word* stands in the Genitive: 1 Tim. vi. 17 μὴ ἡλπιέσθαι ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι *not to trust in the uncertainty of riches* i.e. in riches which are uncertain, Rom. vi. 4 ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν, vii. 6.

This form of expression, however, is not arbitrary, but is designed to give greater prominence to the main idea, which if expressed by an adjective would recede more into the background. It is rhetorical, therefore, not grammatical. Cf. Zumpt, Lat. Gramm. S. 554 and examples from Greek authors in Held, Plut. Timol. p. 368.

Properly only those passages come under this head in which, to the substantive that is followed by a Genitive, a verb is joined which from the nature of the case suits rather the substantive in the Genitive, and consequently points it out as the principal noun (as, ingemuit corvi *stupor*, or the above ἐλπίζ. ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι). On the other hand, such passages as the following are to be decidedly excluded from this class:² Col. ii. 5 βλέπων τὸ στερέωμα τῆς πίστεως, 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως
222 ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ, Gal. ii. 14 ὀρθοποδεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ii. 5, also
7th ed. 2 Thess. ii. 11 πέμπει ἐνέργειαν πλάνης. In Heb. ix. 2 ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἁγίων

¹ On the case in which an adjective as a predicate is expressed by means of a substantive for rhetorical reasons, as in 2 Cor. iii. 9 εἰ ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, see § 58.

² Fr. Rom. I. 367 sq. has objected to this separation, which however he appears to have misunderstood. In passages of the second kind the statement is merely logical, in those of the first it is rhetorical. When it is said, *live according to the truth of the Gospel*, we are to understand the words in their proper and natural meaning (the *truth* of the Gospel is the rule of life); but when it is said, *corvi stupor ingemuit*, the statement is *figurative*, like, *his blood called for vengeance*. Cic. N. D. 2, 50, 127 belongs to the second class, and foedo odore would be the less exact expression.

signifies: *the setting before, exposition, of the bread*; and in 1 Pet. i. 2 *ἀγιασμός πνεύματος*, as a glance at the context will show, is not synonymous with *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*. Lastly, the phrase *λαμβάνειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος* in Acts ii. 33; Gal. iii. 14 means: *obtain the promise of the Spirit*, which happens when the promised blessing itself is received (*κομίζεσθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*), when the promise becomes fulfilment.

b. Far more frequently so that the noun which expresses a *quality* (mostly moral) stands in the Genitive: Luke iv. 22 *λόγοι τῆς χάριτος*, xvi. 8 *οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, xviii. 6 *κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας*, Col. i. 13 *υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης*, Rev. xiii. 3 *ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου mortal wound*, Rom. i. 26 *πάθη ἀτιμίας*, 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jas. i. 25; Heb. i. 3.¹ This, in prose, is a Hebraistic mode of expression, (and is to be 251 attributed not merely to the want of adjectives in Hebrew, Ewald 212 572, but to the peculiar vividness of the Oriental languages).^{7th ed.} In the more elevated style, however, there are instances of the same construction even in Greek authors, see Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 826, cf. Pfochen, diatr. p. 29; but the examples in Georgi, Vind. p. 214 sqq. are nearly all useless.² In later writers it intrudes into plain prose, Eustath. Gramm. p. 478.

If in such expressions a Gen. of a personal pronoun be annexed, it is rendered as belonging to the entire idea; as, Heb. i. 3 *τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ* *by his mighty word*, Col. i. 13; Rev. iii. 10; xiii. 3. It is common to go still further, and to assert (e.g. Vorst, Hebraism. p. 570 sq.; Storr, observ. p. 234 sq.) that when two nouns combined denote *one* principal notion, the *demonstrative* pronoun also, according to the Hebrew idiom (?), agrees grammatically with the governed noun; ³ as, Acts v. 20 *τὰ ῥήματα* 223 *τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης* for *ταῦτα these words of life*, xiii. 26 *ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας* 7th ed. *ταύτης this doctrine of salvation*, Rom. vii. 24 *ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου*, cf. the Peschito *ܠܕܡܘܬ ܡܢ ܐܬܪ ܡܪܬܐ*. But this rule (which even Bengel has adopted) is imaginary. In Rom. vii. *τούτου* may have been construed with *σώματος* by Paul himself; but it is not without ap-

¹ But 2 Thess. i. 7 *ἄγγελοι δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ* are *angels of his power*, i.e. who serve his power.

² The Genitive of *material* does not come under this head. The expression *λίθου κριός* e.g. was to the Greeks like our *ram of stone*, and it is only the Latin idiom that would require the use of the adjective here. Likewise *ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας* Phil. iv. 18 (cf. Aristot. rhet. 1, 11, 9) is probably *fragrance of sweet odor*, and not quite equivalent to *εὐώδης*. That 1 Cor. x. 16 *τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας* and Rom. i. 4 *πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης* are not to be explained by the above rule, is now admitted by the best expositors. For still more unsatisfactory examples, see *Glass*, I, 26 sq.

³ Some attempt to prove this to be a Hebraism by Ezra ix. 14 *הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת*, where, however, there is no necessity whatever for construing *הַמִּצְוָה* with the second substantive.

proper sense, if connected with *θανάτου*. As the apostle had already said much of *θάνατος* (verse 10 ff.), he might naturally refer to it; see de Wette in loc. Likewise in Acts xiii. *σωτήρ Ἰησοῦς* had already been expressed in verse 23, and accordingly *ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης* means: *the word of this* (through Christ effected) *salvation*. In Acts v. the pronoun refers to the salvation which the apostles were then engaged in preaching. Even the Hebrew construction, as *שׁוּבָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל* Isa. ii. 20 or *שׁוּבָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל* Ps. lxxxix. 21, which, though according to the rule, is at the same time much more natural as both words are properly one, has not been literally translated so in the Sept. Cf. Isa. as above, *τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ τὰ ἄργυρά*, 252 Deut. i. 41 *τὰ σκεῖη τὰ πολεμικὰ αὐτοῦ*, Ps. as above, *ἐν εὐαίῳ ἁγίῳ*. In fact it is not easy to perceive, how Luke and Paul, in statements so simple, came to employ such an irregular construction. What Georgi, Vind. p. 204 sqq., and Munthe, obs. Acts v. 20, quote from Greek authors, loses all plausibility when closely examined (Fr. Exc. 1. ad Mr. p. 771 sq.).

Note 1. The Hebraism (Gesen. Lehrgeb. S. 661; Vorst. Heb. 282 sq.) 213 according to which the Neuter of an adjective is expressed by its Feminine. 6th ed. is said to occur in Luke xi. 33 *εἰς κρυπτήν τίθησι*. Absurd! *κρυπτή* had already become a substantive, signifying a *covered place* or *passage*, a *subterraneous receptacle, vault* (Athen. 5, 205); and this meaning is quite appropriate in the passage. On the other hand, Matt. xxi. 42 (Mark xii. 11) *παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη (τοῦτο), καὶ ἐστὶ θαυμαστή (θαυμαστόν)* is a quotation from Ps. cxvii. 23; even the Sept., however, may have referred the Feminine to *κεφαλὴ γωνίας* (Wolf. cur. ad h. l.).

Note 2. We must here mention another Hebraistic (Vorst, Hebraism. 467 sqq.) circumlocution (as it is called) for certain concrete adjectives when employed as substantives, viz. by the use of *υἱός* or *τέκνον* followed by a Genitive of the abstract; as, *υἱοὶ ἀπειθείας* Eph. ii. 2 i.e. *the disobedient*, *υἱοὶ φωτός* Luke xvi. 8; Jno. xii. 36, *τέκνα φωτός* Eph. v. 8. *τέκνα ὀργῆς* ii. 3, *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς* 1 Pet. i. 14, *τέκνα κατάρτας* 2 Pet. ii. 14, *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας* 2 Thess. ii. 3. Every one must feel that these expressions are not mere circumlocutions, but phrases which bring out the meaning with greater vivacity and force. This phraseology is traceable to the vivid imagination of Orientals, which even in the realm of ideas represents the most intimate 224 relationship (derivation or dependence) under the image of son or child 7th ed. (Ecclus. iv. 11). *Children of disobedience*, therefore, are those who belong to *ἀπειθεία* as a child to its mother—those in whom disobedience has become predominant and a second nature (compare in Hebrew, Deut. iii. 18; xxv. 2; 2 Sam. xii. 5; Ps. lxxxix. 23). (The expressions *παῖδες ἱατρῶν, δυστήνων*—especially in Lucian—Schaeff. Dion. 313, grammatically rather resemble *υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. *Παῖς* or *τέκνον* joined to an abstract noun, as in the preceding quotations, neither Schwarz nor Georgi has been able to vindicate by any passage from Greek prose. For an instance from ecclesiastical authors, see Epiphan. Opp. I. 380 b. *οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀληθείας*

πίστεως. Strictly similar phraseology is not to be expected in modern European languages; *child of death*, for instance, is derived from the diction of the Bible. In the more elevated style, however, a few such expressions are used: every one *is the offspring of his age*. See, in general, Steiger on 1 Pet. as above; Gurlitt in Stud. u. Kritik. 1829, S. 728 f. Of a different nature is 2 Thess. ii. 3 ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας — not i. q. ὁ ἁμαρτωλός — *the man of sin*, that is, he who peculiarly belongs to sin, the representative of sin, its personification.)

Note 3. In Eph. vi. 12 the expression τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας is 253 peculiar. The Greek idiom to which expositors here refer (see Koppe in loc.; Fischer, Weller. III. I. 295), παρθενικοί for παρθένοι (Lob. Paralip. 305 sq.), was in the better period merely poetical, and is not quite analogous. In the Byzantines, however, we find e. g. ἡ ἱππική for ἡ ἵππος (Ducas, p. 18); and (τὰ) δαιμόνια, which was originally an adjective but which in later Greek is used substantively along with δαίμονες, affords in the main a proper analogy. A Genitive joined to it e. g. τὰ δαιμόνια τοῦ ἀέρος would present no difficulty. But in the above passage of Eph. the abstract appears to have been purposely chosen as a contrast to πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα: *your struggle is not against outward but against spiritual adversaries*. If, however, any one is unwilling to take πνευματικὰ for πνεύματα, 214 it can only be regarded as a collective Plural, like τὰ ληστρικά in Polyaen. 6th ed. 5, 14 (robber-hordes, from τὸ ληστρικόν the robber class or profession) Lob. Phryn. 242, and rendered: *the spiritualities of wickedness*, wicked spiritual powers; see Mey. in loc.

§ 35. COMPARATIVE.¹

1. Degrees of Comparison are expressed exactly as in classical Greek; that is, by means of the appropriate form of the adjective, that with which the comparison is made being subjoined in the Genitive, or, especially when it is a whole clause,² connected by ἤ: 225 Jno. iv. 12 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν; i. 51; xiii. 16; Mark 7th ed. xii. 31; 1 Cor. i. 25; 1 Tim. v. 8; Heb. xi. 26; Jno. iv. 1 πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ ἢ Ἰωάννης, 1 Cor. xiv. 5; 1 Jno. iv. 4; Rom. xiii. 11 ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία ἣ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν, 2 Pet. ii. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 15; Klotz, Devar. 583. After πλείων or ἐλάττων before a numeral, ἤ is often omitted (Mtth. 1019); so in Acts xxiv. 11 οὐ πλείους εἰσὶ μοι ἡμέραι δεκαδύο, iv. 22; xxiii. 13; xxv. 6; cf. Ter. Ad. 2, 1, 46 plus quingentos colaphos infregit mihi. See Lob. Phryn. 410 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. p. 261. The contrary in Luke ix. 13.

¹ Cf. in general G. W. Nitzsch de comparativis graecae linguae modis, in his edition of Plat. Ion. Lips. 1822, 8vo.

² In such a case we find in the Sept. the Genitive of the Infinitive also, Gen. iv. 13.

b. An Acc. of the Subject and of the Predicate (Mtth. 934 f.) ; as, Jno. vi. 15 ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλέα, Luke xix. 46 ὑμεῖς αὐτὸν (οἶκον) ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον ληστῶν, Heb. i. 2 ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον (i. 13), Jas. v. 10 ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε τῆς κακοπαθείας . . . τοὺς 214 προφήτας, Heb. xii. 9 τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς πατέρας εἶχομεν παιδευτάς, 7th ed. Phil. iii. 7 ταῦτα (κέρδη) ἤγγημαί ζην, 2 Pet iii. 15 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγείσθε, Luke i. 59 ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ . . . Ζαχαρίαν, vs. 53 (Pol. 15, 2, 4). So, in particular, with verbs of 204 *making, naming* (appointing), *constituting, viewing* as, etc., Matt. 6th ed. iv. 19 ; xxii. 43 ; Jno. v. 11 ; x. 33 ; xix. 7 ; Acts v. 31 ; vii. 10 ; xx. 28 ; Luke xii. 14 ; Rom. iii. 25 ; vi. 11 ; viii. 29 ; 1 Cor. iv. 9 ; ix. 5 ; 2 Cor. iii. 6 ; Eph. ii. 14 ; Phil. ii. 29 ; Tit. ii. 7 ; Heb. vii. 28 ; xi. 26 ; Jas. ii. 5 ; Rev. xxi. 5 ; 2 Sam. ii. 5, 13 ; iii. 15.

The Acc. of the Predicate (of destination) is, however, sometimes annexed with the preposition εἰς, — Acts xiii. 22 ἤγειρεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δαυὶδ εἰς βασιλέα, vii. 21 ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἐαυτῇ εἰς νίον, *for, as, a son*,¹ xiii. 47 (cf. also the Passive λογίζεσθαι εἰς τι Acts xix. 27 ; Rom. ii. 26 ; ix. 8, § 29, 3. Note), — or with ὡς, as 2 Thess. iii. 15 καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν (τοῦτον 14) ἡγείσθε (ᾗ βῆ). This is a Hebraistic construction (Ewald, Gr. 603), and is frequently imitated in the Sept., Isa. xlix. 6 ; 2 Kings iv. 1 ; Judith iii. 8 ; v. 11 ; Gen. xii. 2 ; xliii. 17 ; 1 Sam. xv. 11 ; Esth. ii. 7 ; iv. 4. What has been adduced from classic Greek as parallel to the construction with εἰς is different from it, as the εἰς of destination in Her. 1, 34 πάντες τοῖσι χρέονται ἐς πόλεμον, or Eurip. Troad. 1201 οὐ γὰρ εἰς κάλλος τύχας δαίμων δίδωσι, or Alciph. 3, 28. On the other hand, real parallels occur in later writers, e.g. Niceph. Constant. p. 51, ed. Bonn. : ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἅπας δῆμος . . . ἀναγορεύουσιν εἰς βασιλέα 242 Ἀρτέμιον, p. 18 εἰς γυναῖκα δίδωμί σοι αὐτήν, Geo. Pachym. I. 349 τὴν ἐκείνου ἔκγονον λαβὼν εἰς γυναῖκα, Theophan. contin. p. 223 κεχρισμένος εἰς βασιλέα. See, in general, the Index to Pachym., Leo Grammat. and Theophan. in the Bonn edition ; Acta apocr. p. 71. To the latter mode of expression may also be referred Heb. xi. 8 λαμβάν. εἰς κληρονομίαν, and perhaps Acts vii. 53 ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων *ye received the law for ordinances of angels*, i.e. as ordinances of angels, see Bengel in loc. ; yet εἰς here may be more easily explained by Matt. xii. 41. In Phil. iv. 16, however, the construction εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν μοι ἐπέμψατε is obviously a different thought from τὴν χρεῖαν μ. ἐπ., and so does not belong here.

¹ On the other hand, cf. Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 24 πόλους εἰς δασμὸν βασιλεῖ τρεφομένους, whereas Arrian, Alex. 1, 26, 5 τοὺς ἵππους, οὓς δασμὸν βασιλεῖ ἔτρεφεν, see Ellendt, in loc.

Essentially the same as the preceding constructions are Luke ix. 14 κατακλίνετε αὐτοὺς κλισίας ἀνὰ πενήκοντα (in rows of 50), Mark vi. 39 ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλίνειν πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια (in separate parties). These Accusatives are most simply understood as predicative. See § 59.

5. Verbs which in the Active voice govern the Acc. both of a person and of a thing, retain as is well known the latter in the Passive; 215 as, 2 Thess. ii. 15 παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε, Luke xvi. 19 ἐνεδιδύσκειτο πορφύραν, Heb. vi. 9; cf. Phil. iii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 13 (without εἰς!). So also in the constructions considered under 2: Luke xii. 48 δαρήσεται ὀλίγας (cf. δέρειν τινὰ πληγὰς), Mark x. 38 τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι, Rev. xvi. 9 (cf. Lucian. Tox. 61; Dion. Hal. IV. 2162, 8). On the other hand, the *Predicative* Acc. passes over into a Nominative: Heb. v. 10 προσαγορευθεὶς 205 ... ἄρχιερεύς, Matt. v. 9 αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται, Jas. iv. 4 ἐχθρὸς θεοῦ καθίσταται. ^{7th ed.} ^{6th ed.}

Further, the Accusative of the thing is retained by such verbs as, in the Active, govern a *Dative* of the person along with the Accusative of a thing,—they being treated when put in the Passive altogether like causal verbs; as, Gal. ii. 7 πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (from πιστεύω τινί τι, in the Passive πιστεύομαι τι), 1 Cor. ix. 17; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 11; ¹ see Fischer, Well. III. I. 437; Mtth. 946. The same analogy is followed by περικείμει Acts xxviii. 20 τὴν ἄλυσιν ταύτην περικείμει (from ἄλυσις περικείται μοι) Heb. v. 2 (d'Orvill. Charit. p. 240; Mtth. 947). Accordingly, in general, the Accusative with Passives indicates the more remote object, particularly that part of the Subject where the quality denoted by the verb resides; as, 1 Tim. vi. 5 διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν (as if from διαφθεῖρ. τινὲ τὸν νοῦν), 2 Tim. iii. 8; Juo. xi. 44 δεδεμένος τοὺς 243 πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας, Phil. i. 11 πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσ., 2 Cor. iii. 18 τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα, Heb. x. 22 f. on which cf. Valcken. ad Herod. 7, 39; Hartung, Casus 61.

Whether Matt. xi. 5 πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, Heb. iv. 2 ἐσμὲν εὐηγγελισμένοι (verse 6) cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 31; Joel ii. 32 also come under this rule or should be referred to εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τινὰ τι, remains doubtful; yet see § 39, 1.

6. The Accusative employed to denote a material object only in a mediate or remote way was by degrees more and more extended, and gave rise to elliptical constructions of various sorts, which we must resolve by prepositions and the like. This phraseology is but slightly used in the N. T. It is mainly in specifications of

¹ On the other hand, e.g. 1 Cor. xiv. 34 οὐκ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, Acts xxvi. 1.

b. An Acc. of the Subject and of the Predicate (Mtth. 934 f.); as, Jno. vi. 15 *ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλέα*, Luke xix. 46 *ὁμοίως αὐτὸν (οἶκον) ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον ληστῶν*, Heb. i. 2 *ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον* (i. 13), Jas. v. 10 *ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε τῆς κακοπαθείας . . . τοῖς 214 προφήταις*, Heb. xii. 9 *τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς πατέρας εἵχοντες παιδευτάς*, 7th ed. Phil. iii. 7 *ταῦτα (κέρδη) ἡγῆμαι ζημίαν*, 2 Pet iii. 15 *τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγείσθε*, Luke i. 59 *ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ . . . Ζαχαρίαν*, vs. 53 (Pol. 15, 2, 4). So, in particular, with verbs of 204 *making, naming* (appointing), *constituting, viewing as*, etc., Matt. 6th ed. iv. 19; xxii. 43; Jno. v. 11; x. 33; xix. 7; Acts v. 31; vii. 10; xx. 28; Luke xii. 14; Rom. iii. 25; vi. 11; viii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 9; ix. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Eph. ii. 14; Phil. ii. 29; Tit. ii. 7; Heb. vii. 28; xi. 26; Jas. ii. 5; Rev. xxi. 5; 2 Sam. ii. 5, 13; iii. 15.

The Acc. of the Predicate (of destination) is, however, sometimes annexed with the preposition *εἰς*, — Acts xiii. 22 *ἡγείρεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δαυὶδ εἰς βασιλέα*, vii. 21 *ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἐαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν*, *for, as, a son*,¹ xiii. 47 (cf. also the Passive *λογίζεσθαι εἰς τι* Acts xix. 27; Rom. ii. 26; ix. 8, § 29, 3. Note), — or with *ὡς*, as 2 Thess. iii. 15 *καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν (τοῦτον 14) ἡγείσθε* (π. 357). This is a Hebraistic construction (Ewald, Gr. 603), and is frequently imitated in the Sept., Isa. xlix. 6; 2 Kings iv. 1; Judith iii. 8; v. 11; Gen. xii. 2; xliii. 17; 1 Sam. xv. 11; Esth. ii. 7; iv. 4. What has been adduced from classic Greek as parallel to the construction with *εἰς* is different from it, as the *εἰς* of destination in Her. 1, 34 *πάντες τοῖσι χρέονται ἐς πόλεμον*, or Eurip. Troad. 1201 *οὐ γὰρ εἰς κάλλος τύχας δαίμων δίδωσι*, or Alciplhr. 3, 28. On the other hand, real parallels occur in later writers, e.g. Niceph. Constant. p. 51, ed. Bonn.: *ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἅπας δῆμος . . . ἀναγορεύουσιν εἰς βασιλέα* 242 *Ἀρτέμιον*, p. 18 *εἰς γυναῖκα δίδωμί σοι αὐτήν*, Geo. Pachym. I. 349 *τὴν ἐκείνου ἔκγονον λαβὼν εἰς γυναῖκα*, Theophan. contin. p. 223 *κεχρισμένος εἰς βασιλέα*. See, in general, the Index to Pachym., Leo Grammat. and Theophan. in the Bonn edition; Acta apocr. p. 71. To the latter mode of expression may also be referred Heb. xi. 8 *λαμβάν. εἰς κληρονομίαν*, and perhaps Acts vii. 53 *ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων* *ye received the law for ordinances of angels*, i.e. as ordinances of angels, see Bengel in loc.; yet *εἰς* here may be more easily explained by Matt. xii. 41. In Phil. iv. 16, however, the construction *εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν μοι ἐπέμψατε* is obviously a different thought from *τὴν χρεῖαν μ. ἐπ.*, and so does not belong here.

¹ On the other hand, cf. Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 24 *πάλους εἰς δασμὸν βασιλεῖ τρεφομένους*, whereas Arrian, Alex. 1, 26, 5 *τοὺς ἵππους, οὓς δασμὸν βασιλεῖ ἔτρεφεν*, see Ellendt, in loc.

Essentially the same as the preceding constructions are Luke ix. 14 *κατακλίνετε αὐτοὺς κλισίας ἀνὰ πενήκοντα* (in rows of 50), Mark vi. 39 *ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλίνειν πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια* (in separate parties). These Accusatives are most simply understood as predicative. See § 59.

5. Verbs which in the Active voice govern the Acc. both of a person and of a thing, retain as is well known the latter in the Passive; 215 as, 2 Thess. ii. 15 *παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε*, Luke xvi. 19 *ἐνεδιδύ-^{7th ed.}σκετο πορφύραν*, Heb. vi. 9; cf. Phil. iii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 13 (without *εἰς*!). So also in the constructions considered under 2: Luke xii. 48 *δαρήσεται ὀλίγας* (cf. *δέρειν τινὰ πληγὰς*), Mark x. 38 *τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι*, Rev. xvi. 9 (cf. Lucian. Tox. 61; Dion. Hal. IV. 2162, 8). On the other hand, the *Pred-*
icate Acc. passes over into a Nominative: Heb. v. 10 *προσαγορευθεὶς* 205
... ἀρχιερεὺς, Matt. v. 9 *αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται*, Jas. iv. 4 *ἔχθρὸς θεοῦ καθίσταται*.^{6th ed.}

Further, the Accusative of the thing is retained by such verbs as, in the Active, govern a *Dative* of the person along with the Accusative of a thing,—they being treated when put in the Passive altogether like causal verbs; as, Gal. ii. 7 *πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* (from *πιστεύω τινί τι*, in the Passive *πιστεύομαι τι*), 1 Cor. ix. 17; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 11;¹ see Fischer, Well. III. I. 437; Mtth. 946. The same analogy is followed by *περίκειμαι* Acts xxviii. 20 *τὴν ἄλυσιν ταύτην περικεῖμαι* (from *ἄλυσιν περικεῖται μοι*) Heb. v. 2 (d'Orvill. Charit. p. 240; Mtth. 947). Accordingly, in general, the Accusative with Passives indicates the more remote object, particularly that part of the Subject where the quality denoted by the verb resides; as, 1 Tim. vi. 5 *διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν* (as if from *διαφθεῖρ. τινὲ τὸν νοῦν*), 2 Tim. iii. 8; Jno. xi. 44 *δεδεμένος τοὺς* 243
πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας, Phil. i. 11 *πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσ.*, 2 Cor. iii. 18 *τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα*, Heb. x. 22 f. on which cf. Valcken. ad Herod. 7, 39; Hartung, Casus 61.

Whether Matt. xi. 5 *πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται*, Heb. iv. 2 *ἐσμὲν εὐηγγελισμένοι* (verse 6) cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 31; Joel ii. 32 also come under this rule or should be referred to *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τινά τι*, remains doubtful; yet see § 39, 1.

6. The Accusative employed to denote a material object only in a mediate or remote way was by degrees more and more extended, and gave rise to elliptical constructions of various sorts, which we must resolve by prepositions and the like. This phraseology is but slightly used in the N. T. It is mainly in specifications of

¹ On the other hand, e.g. 1 Cor. xiv. 34 *οὐκ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν*, Acts xxvi. 1.

time and place that the Acc. as an Objective case is still perceptible to us; as, Luke xxii. 41 ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὥσεί λίθου βολήν he withdrew from them *a stone's cast* (as if by his withdrawing he made the distance of a stone's cast), Jno. vi. 19 ἐληλακότες ὡς σταδίους εἴκοσι πέντε (Mtth. 950), 1 Pet. iv. 2 τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον, Jno. ii. 12 ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας, Luke i. 75; ii. 41; xv. 29; xx. 9; Jno. i. 40; v. 5; xi. 6; Matt. ix. 20; Acts xiii. 21; Heb. xi. 23; iii. 17; Mdv. 33 f. The Acc. is thus in the N. T. commonly employed to denote the *duration* of time (but in Jno. v. 5 ἔτη is governed by ἔχων, see Mey.); sometimes also the 216 (approximate) *point* of time, as Jno. iv. 52 ἐχθὲς ὥραν ἐβδόμην 7th ed. ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός, Acts x. 3; Rev. iii. 3 (where more frequently περί with the Acc. is used) Krü. 13 f.

When the Acc., annexed as a detached word or phrase to other words, gives a closer specification as respects sort, number, degree, sphere — as Jno. vi. 10 ἀνέπεσαν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὥσεί πεντακισχίλιοι (*in number*), cf. Isocr. big. 842; Aristot. pol. 2, 8; Ptol. 4, 6, 34 (many others in Lob. Phryn. p. 364 sq. and Paralip. 528), Jude 7 τὸν ὅμοιον τούτοις τρόπον ἐκπορνεύσασαι, Matt. xxiii. 37 ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει, 2 Tim. iii. 8 (Plat. rep. 7, 517 c.; 206 Plut. educ. 4, 4; 9, 18), Acts xviii. 3 σκηνοποῖς τὴν τέχνην (Lucian. 6th ed. asin. 43; Agath. 2, 46; Acta apocr. p. 61) — it resembles most nearly the Passive construction under 5.¹ This accusative, however, is very rare in the N. T.; even in Acts xviii. 3 the best Codd. [Sin. also] have τῇ τέχνῃ, cf. § 31. On the other hand, a number of strictly adverbial Accusatives, which were probably very current in the language of conversation, have found their way into the 244 N. T.; as, μακράν (*afar*), μάτην (*in cassum*), ἀκμήν (*this moment*) yet, τὴν ἀρχήν (Jno. viii. 25), δωρεάν, τὸ τέλος (1 Pet. iii. 8), cf. § 54, 1. See, in general, Hm. Vig. p. 882 sq. To the same class of constructions belong also parenthetical phrases, such as Rom. xii. 18 εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες, ix. 5 (i. 15) Heb. ii. 17; v. 1; Rom. xv. 17; Mtth. 734; Mdv. 36 f.

How the Acc. of quality coincides with the Dative has already been noticed. Thus τῷ ἀριθμῷ is used for τὸν ἀριθμόν. Usually, however, we find the Acc. in classic Greek where in the N. T. the Dative is employed; e.g. τὸ γένος (*natione*) Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 2; Herod. 1, 8, 2; D. S. 1, 4; Arrian. Al. 1, 27, 8 and τῷ γένει Mark vii. 26; Acts iv. 36 (Palaeoph. 6, 2; 11, 2), ἐκλύεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ Heb. xii. 3 and τὴν ψυχὴν Diod. S. 20, 1, βραδεὶς τῇ καρδίᾳ Luke xxiv. 25, but βραδὺς τὸν νοῦν Dion. II. de Lys. p. 243 Lips.

¹ On the Hebrew cf. Ewald 591 f.

See Krü. 15; Lob. Paralip. 528 (Wetst. N. T. I. 826). In Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 b. we find *θρασὺς τῷ βίῳ* and *μὴ πολίτης τὴν φύσιν* side by side. For *τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον* even Greek prose authors more frequently employ *κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον*.

Very extraordinary is the expression *ὁδὸν θαλάσσης* in Matt. iv. 15 (from Isaiah) which is rendered *by the way*. Passages such as 1 Sam. vi. 9 *εἰ ὁδὸν ὁρίων αὐτῆς πορεύσεται* (Wunder on Lob. Sophocl. Aj. 41 f.) Num. xxi. 33; Exod. xiii. 17 (cf. Luke ii. 44), do not authenticate that Acc. without government (by a verb), in an address containing Vocatives. Such a construction would quite exceed the limits of prose composition (Bhdy. 114 f.). What Thiersch p. 145 sq. remarks, is not decisive. Should we perhaps read *οἱ ὁδὸν θαλάσσης (οἰκοῦντες)*, with the Sept.? It is difficult to maintain with Mey. that *εἶδε* in verse 16 is the governing verb. The topographical difficulties of the usual interpretation are not invincible; only we must not, as in the prophet, take *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* as an in-²¹⁷dependent clause, as that would not apply to this passage in Matthew. ^{7th ed.}

7. In some passages the Accusative is said to be used absolutely, when on closer examination the grammatical reason for the Acc. can be discovered in the structure of the sentence. Thus in Rom. viii. 3 *τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου . . . ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας . . . κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* is properly equivalent to *τὸ ἀδύν. τοῦ νόμου ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, πέμψας . . . καὶ κατακρίνων* etc. (where *ἀδύνατον* does not require to be taken in a passive sense); this, however, may also be a Nominative put at the commencement (cf. Wisd. xvi. 17). In Acts xxvi. 3 the Acc. *γνώστην ὄντα* is undoubtedly to be explained as an anacoluthon, which, when ²⁰⁷ participles are annexed, is of frequent occurrence; see § 63, I. 2 a. ^{6th ed.} Schwarz, de soloec. p. 94 sq., has adduced nothing altogether of the ²⁴⁵ same kind. In Luke xxiv. 46 f. *ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν . . . καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν . . . ἀρχάμενον ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ*, the Acc. (in the construction of the Acc. with the Infinitive) is in itself grammatically clear; only the reference of *ἀρχάμενον* is loose: *beginning* (viz. the *κηρύσσων*), or, impersonally, *that it should be begun*; cf. Her. 3, 91. See besides Kypke I. 344 sq. In Rev. i. 20 the Accs. depend on *γράφον* verse 19, as has long been admitted. Lastly, in Rev. xxi. 17 *ἐμέτρησε τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἑκατὸν τεσσαρ. πηχῶν, μέτρον ἀνθρώπου* etc., the last words are a loose apposition to the clause *ἐμέτρ. τὸ τεῖχος* etc.; cf. Mtth. 916. Further, cf. Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 501; Hartung, S. 54; Wannowski, Syntax. anom. p. 128 sqq. On an Acc. in apposition to a whole clause, as Rom. xii. 1, see § 59, 9.

33. CONNECTION OF A VERB (NEUTER) WITH ITS DEPENDENT NOUN BY MEANS OF PREPOSITIONS.

A considerable number of verbs, particularly such as denote an affection or a tendency of the mind, are connected with their predicate by means of a preposition. In this respect the diction of the N. T. sometimes accords with classic usage, and sometimes displays more of a Hebrew and Oriental tinge. We arrange the verbs in question as follows :

a. Verbs of *rejoicing* or *grieving*, which in Greek authors are frequently construed with the Dative alone (Fr. Rom. III. 78 sq.), take for the most part the preposition *ἐπί* with the Dat. (cf. Wurm, Dinarch. p. 40 sq.), as *χαίρειν* Matt. xviii. 13 ; Luke i. 14 ; Acts xv. 31 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 6 ; Rev. xi. 10 (cf. Xen. C. 8, 4, 12 ; D. S. 19, 55 ; Isocr. permut. 738 ; Arrian. Ind. 35, 8), *εὐφραίνεσθαι* Rev. xviii. 20 (Ecclus. xvi. 1 ; 1 Macc. xi. 44 ; Xen. conv. 7, 5), *συλλυπεῖσθαι* Mark iii. 5 (Xen. Mem. 3, 9, 8 ; cf. *χαλεπῶς φέρειν ἐπὶ* 218 *τινι* Xen. H. 7, 4, 21) ; but sometimes also *ἐν* (*λυπεῖν ἐν* Jacobs, 7th ed. Achill. Tat. p. 814), as *χαίρειν* Luke x. 20 ; Phil. i. 18 (Col. i. 24. cf. Soph. Trach. 1119), *εὐφραίνεσθαι* Acts vii. 41, *ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι* 1 Pet. i. 6 (but *ἀγάλλεσθαι ἐπὶ* Xen. Mem. 2, 6, 35 ; 3, 5, 16).

Of verbs of *being angry*, *ἀγανακτεῖν* is construed with *περί* (to be 246 *angry on account of* some one) Matt. xx. 24 ; Mark x. 41 ; but (like *ἀγανακτεῖν ἐπὶ* Lucian. abdic. 9 ; Aphthon. progymn. c. 9 p. 267) *ὀργίζεσθαι ἐπὶ τινι* Rev. xii. 17 ; cf. Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 9, 8 (in the Sept. even *ὀργίζεσθαι ἐν τινι* Judg. ii. 14, in later Greek writers *ὀργίζεσθαι κατὰ τινος* as Malal. p. 43, 102, 165, etc.). The opposite, *εὐδοκεῖν*, is construed, in imitation of the Hebrew *אֶפְרַח* and after the example of the Sept., with *ἐν* (to have pleasure *in*), whether used in reference to persons Matt. iii. 17 ; Luke iii. 22 ; 1 Cor. x. 5 or things 2 Cor. xii. 10 ; 2 Thess. ii. 12 (*θέλειν ἐν* Col. ii. 18 cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 22 ?) ; in classic Greek the Dative alone would be sufficient. 208 *Ἀρκεῖσθαι*, which usually takes a Dative (Luke iii. 14 ; Heb. xiii. 5), 6th ed. is once, 3 Jno. 10, construed with *ἐπὶ*.

b. Verbs denoting *wonder*, *amazement*, take *ἐπὶ* with the Dative ; so *θαυμάζειν* Mark xii. 17 ; Luke xx. 26, *ἐκπλήσσεσθαι* Matt. xxi. 33 ; Mark i. 22 ; xi. 18 ; Luke iv. 32 ; Acts xiii. 12, which is also very common in Greek authors. *Θαυμάζειν περί τινος* Luke ii. 18 (Isaeus 3, 28 cf. Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 244) or even *διὰ τι* *on account of something* Mark vi. 6, as Aelian. 12, 6 ; 14, 36 *θαυμάζειν τινὰ διὰ τι*. But *θαυμάζειν ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν* Luke i. 21 may mean

during his tarrying; yet cf. Sir. xi. 21. On *ξενίζεσθαι τινι* see above, § 31, 1, f. p. 209.

c. Of verbs signifying *to pity*, *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* usually takes *ἐπὶ* either with the Acc., Matt. xv. 32; Mark vi. 34; viii. 2; ix. 22, or with the Dat., Luke vii. 13; Matt. xiv. 14, only once Matt. ix. 36 it takes *περὶ*; but *ἐλεεῖσθαι* is used as a transitive, see § 32, 1, b. a.

d. Verbs of *relying on*, *trusting*, *hoping*, *boasting*, are construed with *ἐπὶ*, *ἐν*, *εἰς*; as, *πέποιθα ἐπὶ τινι* Mark x. 24; Luke xi. 22; 2 Cor. i. 9 (Agath. 209, 5; 306, 20), *ἐπὶ τι* or *τινα* Matt. xxvii. 43; 2 Thess. iii. 4, with *ἐν* Phil. iii. 3; *πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τινι* Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 6 Sept. (on *πιστεύειν εἰς* or *ἐπὶ τινα* believe on one, see above, § 31, 5), *ἐλπίζω ἐπὶ* with Dat. Rom. xv. 12; Phil. iv. 10 (Pol. 1, 82, 6) and with Acc. 1 Tim. v. 5; 1 Macc. ii. 61, *εἰς* Jno. v. 45; 2 Cor. i. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 5; Ecclus. ii. 9 (Herod. 7, 10, 1; Joseph. bell. jud. 6, 2, 1, ἡ εἰς τινα ἐλπίς Plut. Galba c. 19), *ἐν* 1 Cor. xv. 19 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 25; Mem. 4, 2, 28; Pol. 1, 59, 2 ἐλπίδα ἔχειν ἔν τ.), *καυχᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τινι* Rom. v. 2 (Ps. xlviii. 7; Ecclus. xxx. 2; D. S. 16, 70, similarly *σεμνύνεσθαι* Diog. L. 2, 71; Isocr. big. p. 840 and *φυσιοῦσθαι* Diog. L. 6, 24), more frequently *ἐν* Rom. ii. 17, 23; v. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 21; Gal. vi. 13 (Ps. cxlix. 5; Jer. ix. 23), but not *κατὰ* 2 Cor. xi. 18 see Mey. in loc., also not *ὑπέρ* 2 Cor. vii. 14 cf. ix. 2.

e. Of verbs of *sinning*, *offending against*, *ἀμαρτάνειν* is connected by *εἰς* with the object sinned against, Matt. xviii. 21; Luke xvii. 4; 1 Cor. vi. 18 etc., cf. Soph. Oed. C. 972; Her. 1, 138; Isocr. panath. p. 644; permut. p. 750 and Aegin. p. 920, 934; Mr. Anton. 7, 26; Wetsten. I. 443; on the other hand, *ἀμαρτάν. πρὸς τινα* Joseph. antt. 14, 15, 2, *περὶ τινα* Isocr. permut. 754 (*ἀμαρτ. τινί* 1 Sam. xiv. 33; 1 Kings viii. 31, 33; Judg. x. 10).

f. The verbs *ἀρέσκειν* please, and *φανῆναι* appear (so and so), instead of the Dative of the person to whom something gives pleasure or appears (in such or such a light), are connected with the noun by the Hellenistic preposition *ἐνώπιον*; as, Acts vi. 5 *ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους* (Deut. i. 23), Luke xxiv. 11 *ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα*. In the Sept. *ἀρέσκειν* occurs also with *ἐναντίον* τινός Num. xxxvi. 6; Gen. xxxiv. 18; 1 Macc. vi. 60.

g. Of verbs of *seeing*, *βλέπειν* is often construed with *εἰς* (*intueri*) Jno. xiii. 22; Acts iii. 4, which is not unknown to classic Greek also; see Wahl.

There is properly speaking a redundancy when verbs of *following* are

construed with the preposition *μετά* or *σύν* (cf. *comitari cum aliquo* in Latin 209 inscriptions), Rev. vi. 8; xiv. 13; see Wetst. N. T. I. 717; Lob. Phryn. 6th ed. p. 354; Schaef. Dem. V. 590; Hm. Lucian. p. 178; Krü. 63. The phrase *ἀκολουθῶ ἐπίσω τινός* (עֲרַבְיָא) Matt. x. 38 (Isa. xlv. 14) is Hebraistic.

Substantives derived from such verbs are in the same way connected with the object by means of prepositions; as, *πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ* Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 15 etc., *παρουσία πρὸς ὑμᾶς* Phil. i. 26, *θλίψεις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* Eph. iii. 13, *ζῆλος ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ* 2 Cor. vii. 7, see Fr. Rom. I. 195, 365 sq.

§ 34. ADJECTIVES.

1. Although the two sorts of nouns, substantive and adjective, are distinct from each other in thought, yet the latter (including participles) enter the sphere of substantives far more abundantly in Greek than, for instance, in Latin. This they do whether they have or have not the Article, and in every gender; sometimes owing to an original ellipsis, and sometimes without an ellipsis, 248 by virtue of the Gender, whether masculine or neuter, peculiar to them (Krü. 2 f.); as, *ἡ ἔρημος* (γῆ), *τῇ ἐπιούσῃ* (ἡμέρᾳ), *διοπετές* (ἄγαλμα) Acts xix. 35, *τὸ σηρικόν* (ὑφασμα?) Rev. xviii. 12, *ὁ σοφός*, *ὁ κλέπτων* Eph. iv. 28, *βασιλικός*, *ὁ ἄρχων*, *ἀλλότριοι* *strangers*, *κακοποιοί* *evil-doers*, *τὸ ἀγαθόν* (*τὸ πνευματικόν*, *ψυχικόν* 1 Cor. xv. 46?).

On adjectives which have become substantives by an ellipsis, see § 64. Among expressions relating to persons, as *σοφός*, *οἱ σοφοί*, the following are characteristic of the N. T.: *ὁ πιστός* *the believer*, *πιστοί* *believers*, *ἄγιοι*, *ἐκλεκτοί*, *ἁμαρτωλοί* Rom. xv. 31; xvi. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 15; 1 Tim. i. 15; v. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Heb. xii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 22; so even with an attributive Adjective, Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2 *καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους*, or with a 220 Gen. Rom. viii. 33 *ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ*. In all these cases persons are indicated 7th ed. to whom the quality in question belongs; and there is no necessity for supplying *ἄνθρωποι* (or *ἀδελφοί*). Likewise where *ὁ ἀληθινός* 1 Jno. v. 20 is used of God, or *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ* Luke iv. 34 of Christ, or *ὁ πονηρός* of the devil, there is no ellipsis of those substantives, but the notion is grammatically complete: *the True, the Holy One of God*; and what individual is distinctively so called in Biblical diction, must be ascertained from other sources.

2. Especially frequent and diversified are Neuters used substantively (Krü. 3). Many of these even regularly take the place of a substantive derivable (but not always actually existing) from the root; and this, not only in reference to things sensible, *μέσον*, *ἔσχατον*, *μικρόν*, *βραχύ*, *ὀλίγον*, *φανερὸν*, *κρυπτόν*, *ἐλαττον*, *ἄρσεν*, etc., especially with a preposition (*εἰς τὸ μέσον* Mark iii. 3; Jno. xx. 19,

μετὰ μικρόν Matt. xxvi. 73, ἐν ὀλίγῳ Acts xxvi. 29, ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Matt. vi. 4, εἰς φανερόν Mark iv. 22), but also mental and abstract, particularly with a Gen. annexed, as Rom. ii. 4 τὸ χρηστὸν τ. θεοῦ (ἡ χρηστότης), Heb. vi. 17 τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς, Rom. viii. 3; ix. 22; 1 Cor. i. 25; 2 Cor. iv. 17; Phil. iii. 8 τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως, iv. 5 τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν. Instead of the Gen. another construction is selected in Rom. i. 15 τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον (τὸ πρόθυμον ²¹⁰ purpose Eur. Iphig. 983). The Plurals of adjectives are regularly ^{54 ed} concretes, and denote whole classes of things (persons); as, τὰ ὁρατὰ κ. ἀόρατα Col. i. 16, ἐπουράνια and ἐπίγεια Jno. iii. 12; Phil. ii. 10, τὰ βαθέα Rev. ii. 24, ἀρχαῖα 2 Cor. v. 17. Such adjectives, moreover, sometimes are made more specific by the context: thus, ἐπουράνια Jno. as above heavenly *truths*, Phil. ii. 10 heavenly *beings*, Eph. ii. 6; iii. 10 heavenly *places* (i.e. οὐρανοί, cf. var. Eph. i. 20) etc. In Rom. i. 20 τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ the Plural refers to the partition that follows, ἣ τε αἰδῖος δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης, and Philippi has 249 explained the word more correctly than Fr. (On Eph. vi. 12 πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, see Note 3.)

The expression τὸ δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως in 1 Pet. i. 7 does not come under this head, as δοκίμιον of itself is a substantive, (no adjective δοκίμιος exists); further, compare on this passage and on Jas. i. 3, Fr. Prälim. S. 44. In Rom. i. 19, too, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is not simply i.e. ἡ γνώσις τ. θ., otherwise it would not be easy to see why Paul did not employ ἡ γνώσις, so usual to him; but the meaning is either *what is known* (to mankind) *of God*, or *what is knowable* (may be known) *of* (about) *God*. (In reference to the latter meaning of γνωστός, which Thol. questioned, see Soph. Oed. R. 362; Hm. Plat. rep. 7, 517 b.; Arrian. Epict. 2, 20, 4, cf. Schulthess, theol. Annal. 1829, S. 976.) I prefer the former as the simpler. Paul is speaking of the *objective* knowledge, of the sum of that which is known of God (from what source see verse 20). This objective γνωστόν becomes *subjective*, in as far as φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς. This shows, too, why Paul did not use ἡ γνώσις here.

The preceding mode of expression, which flows quite simply from the 221 nature of the Neuter, is not unknown to the Greeks. The later prose ^{74 ed} authors in particular adopted it from the technical language of philosophy. At the same time, the examples collected by Georgi (Hierocrit. I. 39) must be carefully sifted. The following may serve as unquestionable parallels: Demosth. Phil. 1. p. 20 a. τὸ τῶν θεῶν εὐμενές, and de fals. leg. p. 213 a. τὸ ἀσφαλές αὐτῆς, Thuc. 1, 68 τὸ πιστόν τῆς πολιτείας, 2, 71 τὸ ἀσθενές τῆς γνώμης, Galen. protrept. 2 τὸ τῆς τέχνης ἀστατον and τὸ τῆς βάσεως εὐμετακλίστον, Heliod. 2, 15, 83 τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς λύπης, Plat. Phaedr. 240 a.; Strabo 3, 168; Philostr. Ap. 7, 12; D. S. 19, 55; Diog.

L. 9, 63. This construction with the participle is especially characteristic of Thuc. (and the Byzantines). Cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 253; Niebühr, ind. ad Dexipp. Eunap. and Malch. An abstract noun and neuter adjectives in connection occur in Plutarch, Agis 20 ἡ πολλὴ εὐλάβεια καὶ τὸ πρῶτον καὶ φιλόανθρωπον.

3. On the other hand, a notion which should naturally be expressed by an adjective as an epithet,¹ is sometimes, by a change
211 of construction, brought out by a substantive. Yet the N. T. is
6th ed. by no means poor in adjectives; it can show a considerable number
which do not occur in the (early) Greek authors, and some of
which have been formed by the apostles themselves (ἐπιούσιος, σαρ-
250 κικός, πνευματικός, παρείσακτος, πύρινος, ἀκατάκριτος, ἀκρογωνιαίος,
ἀνεπαίσχυντος, αὐτοκατάκριτος, ἀχειροποίητος, βρώσιμος, ἐπιτόβητος,
ἐπερίστατος, ἰσάγγελος, κατείδωλος, κυριακός, ταπεινόφρων etc.).

This substitution of a substantive for an adjective takes place,

a. In such a way that the substantive which is the *principal word*
stands in the Genitive: 1 Tim. vi. 17 μὴ ἡλπιέσθαι ἐπὶ πλούτου
ἀδηλότῃ not to trust in the uncertainty of riches i.e. in riches
which are uncertain, Rom. vi. 4 ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἐν κακότητι ζωῆς περιπα-
τήσωμεν, vii. 6.

This form of expression, however, is not arbitrary, but is designed
to give greater prominence to the main idea, which if expressed
by an adjective would recede more into the background. It is
rhetorical, therefore, not grammatical. Cf. Zumpt, Lat. Gramm. S.
554 and examples from Greek authors in Held, Plut. Timol. p. 368.

Properly only those passages come under this head in which, to the
substantive that is followed by a Genitive, a verb is joined which from
the nature of the case suits rather the substantive in the Genitive, and
consequently points it out as the principal noun (as, ingemuit corvi *stupor*,
or the above ἐλπίζ. ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότῃ). On the other hand, such pas-
sages as the following are to be decidedly excluded from this class:² Col.
ii. 5 βλέπων τὸ στερέωμα τῆς πίστεως, 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως
222 ᾗ τοῦ θεοῦ. Gal. ii. 14 ὀρθοποδεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ii. 5, also
1th ed. 2 Thess. ii. 11 πέμπει ἐνέργειαν πλάνης. In Heb. ix. 2 ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἁγίων

¹ On the case in which an adjective as a predicate is expressed by means of a substan-
tive for rhetorical reasons, as in 2 Cor. iii. 9 εἰ ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, see § 58.

² Fr. Rom. I. 367 sq. has objected to this separation, which however he appears to
have misunderstood. In passages of the second kind the statement is merely logical,
in those of the first it is rhetorical. When it is said, *live according to the truth of the*
Gospel, we are to understand the words in their proper and natural meaning (the *truth*
of the Gospel is the rule of life); but when it is said, *corvi stupor ingemuit*, the statement
is *figurative*, like, *his blood called for vengeance*. Cic. N. D. 2, 50, 127 belongs to the
second class, and foedo odore would be the less exact expression.

signifies: *the setting before, exposition, of the bread*; and in 1 Pet. i. 2 ἄγιασμός πνεύματος, as a glance at the context will show, is not synonymous with πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Lastly, the phrase λαμβάνειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος in Acts ii. 33; Gal. iii. 14 means: *obtain the promise of the Spirit*, which happens when the promised blessing itself is received (κομίζεσθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν), when the promise becomes fulfilment.

b. Far more frequently so that the noun which expresses a *quality* (mostly moral) stands in the Genitive: Luke iv. 22 λόγοι τῆς χάριτος, xvi. 8 οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας, xviii. 6 κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, Col. i. 13 υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης, Rev. xiii. 3 ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου *mortal wound*, Rom. i. 26 πάθη ἀτιμίας, 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jas. i. 25; Heb. i. 3.¹ This, in prose, is a Hebraistic mode of expression, (and is to be 251 attributed not merely to the want of adjectives in Hebrew, Ewald 212 572, but to the peculiar vividness of the Oriental languages).^{7th ed.} In the more elevated style, however, there are instances of the same construction even in Greek authors, see Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 826, cf. Pfochen, diatr. p. 29; but the examples in Georgi, Vind. p. 214 sqq. are nearly all useless.² In later writers it intrudes into plain prose, Eustath. Gramm. p. 478.

If in such expressions a Gen. of a personal pronoun be annexed, it is rendered as belonging to the entire idea; as, Heb. i. 3 τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ *by his mighty word*, Col. i. 13; Rev. iii. 10; xiii. 3. It is common to go still further, and to assert (e.g. Vorst, Hebraism. p. 570 sq.; Storr, observ. p. 234 sq.) that when two nouns combined denote *one* principal notion, the *demonstrative* pronoun also, according to the Hebrew idiom (?), agrees grammatically with the governed noun;³ as, Acts v. 20 τὰ ῥήματα 223 τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης for ταῦτα *these words of life*, xiii. 26 ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας 7th ed. ταύτης *this doctrine of salvation*, Rom. vii. 24 ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου, cf. the Peschito ܠܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܬܝܬ. But this rule (which even Bengel has adopted) is imaginary. In Rom. vii. τούτου may have been construed with σώματος by Paul himself; but it is not without ap-

¹ But 2 Thess. i. 7 ἄγγελοι δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ are *angels of his power*, i.e. who serve his power.

² The Genitive of *material* does not come under this head. The expression λίθου κριός e.g. was to the Greeks like our ram *of stone*, and it is only the Latin idiom that would require the use of the adjective here. Likewise ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας Phil. iv. 18 (cf. Aristot. rhet. 1, 11, 9) is probably *fragrance of sweet odor*, and not quite equivalent to εὐώδης. That 1 Cor. x. 16 τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας and Rom. i. 4 πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης are not to be explained by the above rule, is now admitted by the best expositors. For still more unsatisfactory examples, see Glass. I, 26 sq.

³ Some attempt to prove this to be a Hebraism by Ezra ix. 14 הַחַיִּים הַהֵם הַזֵּה הַחַיִּים הַהֵם הַזֵּה, where, however, there is no necessity whatever for construing הַחַיִּים with the second substantive.

propriate sense, if connected with *θανάτου*. As the apostle had already said much of *θάνατος* (verse 10 ff.), he might naturally refer to it; see de Wette in loc. Likewise in Acts xiii. *σωτήρ Ἰησοῦς* had already been expressed in verse 23, and accordingly *ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης* means: *the word of this* (through Christ effected) *salvation*. In Acts v. the pronoun refers to the salvation which the apostles were then engaged in preaching. Even the Hebrew construction, as *יְשׁוּעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל* Isa. ii. 20 or *יְשׁוּעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל* Ps. lxxxix. 21, which, though according to the rule, is at the same time much more natural as both words are properly one, has not been literally translated so in the Sept. Cf. Isa. as above, *τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ*.
 252 Deut. i. 41 *τὰ σκεῖν τὰ πολεμικά αὐτοῦ*, Ps. as above, *ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἀγίῳ*. In fact it is not easy to perceive, how Luke and Paul, in statements so simple, came to employ such an irregular construction. What Georgi, Vind. p. 204 sqq., and Munthe, obs. Acts v. 20, quote from Greek authors, loses all plausibility when closely examined (Fr. Exc. 1. ad Mr. p. 771 sq.).

Note 1. The Hebraism (Gesen. Lehrgeb. S. 661; Vorst, Heb. 282 sq.) according to which the Neuter of an adjective is expressed by its Feminine, 6th ed. is said to occur in Luke xi. 33 *εἰς κρυπτὴν τίθησι*. Absurd! *κρυπτή* had already become a substantive, signifying a *covered place* or *passage*, a *subterraneous receptacle, vault* (Athen. 5, 205); and this meaning is quite appropriate in the passage. On the other hand, Matt. xxi. 42 (Mark xii. 11) *παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη (τοῦτο), καὶ ἐστὶ θαυμαστή (θαυμαστόν)* is a quotation from Ps. cxvii. 23; even the Sept., however, may have referred the Feminine to *κεφαλὴ γωνίας* (Wolf, cur. ad h. l.).

Note 2. We must here mention another Hebraistic (Vorst, Hebraism. 467 sqq.) circumlocution (as it is called) for certain concrete adjectives when employed as substantives, viz. by the use of *νίος* or *τέκνον* followed by a Genitive of the abstract; as, *νιοὶ ἀπειθείας* Eph. ii. 2 i.e. *the disobedient*, *νιοὶ φωτός* Luke xvi. 8; Jno. xii. 36, *τέκνα φωτός* Eph. v. 8. *τέκνα ὀργῆς* ii. 3. *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς* 1 Pet. i. 14, *τέκνα κατάρας* 2 Pet. ii. 14, *ὁ νίος τῆς ἀπωλείας* 2 Thess. ii. 3. Every one must feel that these expressions are not mere circumlocutions, but phrases which bring out the meaning with greater vivacity and force. This phraseology is traceable to the vivid imagination of Orientals, which even in the realm of ideas represents the most intimate 224 relationship (derivation or dependence) under the image of son or child 7th ed. (Ecclus. iv. 11). *Children of disobedience*, therefore, are those who belong to *ἀπειθεία* as a child to its mother—those in whom disobedience has become predominant and a second nature (compare in Hebrew, Deut. iii. 18; xxv. 2; 2 Sam. xii. 5; Ps. lxxxix. 23). (The expressions *παῖδες ἱατρῶν, δυστήνων*—especially in Lucian—Schæf. Dion. 313, grammatically rather resemble *νιοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. *Παῖς* or *τέκνον* joined to an *abstract* noun, as in the preceding quotations, neither Schwarz nor Georgi has been able to vindicate by any passage from Greek prose. For an instance from ecclesiastical authors, see Epiphanius. Opp. I. 380 b. *οἱ νιοὶ τῆς ἀληθείας*

πίστεως. Strictly similar phraseology is not to be expected in modern European languages; *child of death*, for instance, is derived from the diction of the Bible. In the more elevated style, however, a few such expressions are used: every one *is the offspring of his age*. See, in general, Steiger on 1 Pet. as above; Gurlitt in Stud. u. Kritik. 1829, S. 728 f. Of a different nature is 2 Thess. ii. 3 ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας — not i. q. ὁ ἁμαρτωλός — *the man of sin*, that is, he who peculiarly belongs to sin, the representative of sin, its personification.)

Note 3. In Eph. vi. 12 the expression τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας is 253 peculiar. The Greek idiom to which expositors here refer (see Koppe in loc.; Fischer, Weller. III. I. 295), παρθενικοί for παρθένοι (Lob. Paralip. 305 sq.), was in the better period merely poetical, and is not quite analogous. In the Byzantines, however, we find e.g. ἡ ἱππική for ἡ ἵππος (Ducas, p. 18); and (τὰ) δαίμονια, which was originally an adjective but which in later Greek is used substantively along with δαίμονες, affords in the main a proper analogy. A Genitive joined to it e.g. τὰ δαίμονια τοῦ ἀέρος would present no difficulty. But in the above passage of Eph. the abstract appears to have been purposely chosen as a contrast to πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα: *your struggle is not against outward but against spiritual adversaries*. If, however, any one is unwilling to take πνευματικὰ for πνεύματα, 214 it can only be regarded as a collective Plural, like τὰ ληστρικά in Polyæn. 6th ed. 5, 14 (robber-hordes, from τὸ ληστρικόν the robber class or profession) Lob. Phryn. 242, and rendered: *the spiritualities of wickedness*, wicked spiritual powers; see Mey. in loc.

§ 35. COMPARATIVE.¹

1. Degrees of Comparison are expressed exactly as in classical Greek; that is, by means of the appropriate form of the adjective, that with which the comparison is made being subjoined in the Genitive, or, especially when it is a whole clause,² connected by ἤ: 225 Jno. iv. 12 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν; i. 51; xiii. 16; Mark 7th ed. xii. 31; 1 Cor. i. 25; 1 Tim. v. 8; Heb. xi. 26; Jno. iv. 1 πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ ἢ Ἰωάννης, 1 Cor. xiv. 5; 1 Jno. iv. 4; Rom. xiii. 11 ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία ἡ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν, 2 Pet. ii. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 15; Klotz, Devar. 583. After πλείων or ἐλάττων before a numeral, ἤ is often omitted (Mtth. 1019); so in Acts xxiv. 11 οὐ πλείους εἰσὶ μοι ἡμέραι δεκαδύο, iv. 22; xxiii. 13; xxv. 6; cf. Ter. Ad. 2, 1, 46 plus quingentos colaphos infregit mihi. See Lob. Phryn. 410 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. p. 261. The contrary in Luke ix. 13.

¹ Cf. in general G. W. Nitzsch de comparativis graecae linguae modis, in his edition of Plat. Ion. Lips. 1822, 8vo.

² In such a case we find in the Sept. the Genitive of the Infinitive also, Gen. iv. 13.

It is sometimes doubtful whether the Genitive following a Comparative contains the second member of the comparison, or is altogether independent 254 of the comparison. In Heb. iii. 3 *πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου* etc. it is probably most correct to take *οἴκου* in the former way; but 1 Cor. xiii. 13 *μείζων τοιούτων ἡ ἀγάπη* may be rendered: (*greater*) *the greatest (of) among these is love*; see No. 3. Cf. besides, 1 Cor. xii. 23; Luke vii. 42 (Lucian. fug. 6).

The Comparative is strengthened by annexing *μᾶλλον*,¹ 2 Cor. vii. 13 *περισσότερως μᾶλλον* (Plato, legg. 6, 781 a.), Phil. i. 23 *πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρείσσον* (*much more better*), and in reference to another comparison, Mark vii. 36 *ὅσον αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο, αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον περισσώτερον ἐκήρυσσον*, see Fr. in loc.; also by *ἔτι* Heb. vii. 15 *περισσώτερον ἔτι κατάδηλον* (*still more evident*), Phil. i. 9; lastly, by *πολύ*, as 2 Cor. viii. 22 *πολὺ σπουδαίωτερον*. All these are very common in Greek authors (Krü. 79): on *μᾶλλον* see Wyttenb. Plut. 215 I. 238; Ast, Plat. Phaedr. p. 395; legg. p. 44; Boisson. Aristaen. p. 430 sqq. 6th ed. (in Lat. cf. Cic. Pis. 14 *mihi . . . quaevis fuga potius quam ulla provincia esset optatior*); as to *ἔτι* cf. Plat. pol. 298 e.; Xen. M. 1, 5, 6; Cyr. 5, 4, 20; Anab. 1, 9, 10, and as to *πολύ* Xen. M. 2, 10, 2; Lucian. Tim. 50. In Greek authors sometimes *ἔτι πολύ* are conjoined: Xen. M. 2, 1, 27; C. 1, 6, 17; Anab. 7, 5, 15.

Also when prepositions are employed after the Comparative they are designed to give it additional force; as, Luke xvi. 8 *φρονιμώτερον ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτός*, Heb. iv. 12; Judg. xi. 25; xv. 2; xviii. 26; Heb. ix. 23 *κρείττοις θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας*, i. 4; iii. 3; xi. 4; xii. 24; Luke iii. 13. Compare, in reference to *παρά*, Thuc. 1. 23 *πυκνότερον παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν χρόνου μνημονεύμενα*, Dio C. 38, 97. See Hm. Vig. 862.

2. Instead of the Comparative form, the Positive is used,

a. With *μᾶλλον*, partly when the Comparative form seemed uncouth, partly when more emphasis was required (Krü. 78), Acts xx. 35 *μακάριόν ἐστι μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν*, 1 Cor. xii. 22; Gal. iv. 27.

226 7th ed. b. With a preposition following which contains the notion of comparison; as, Philostr. Apol. iii. 19 *παρὰ πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς μέγας*. So Luke xiii. 2 *ἀμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους* (though *ἀμαρ.*, to be sure, has no comparative), Heb. iii. 3. In the Sept. *παρά* and *ὑπὲρ* are often thus used: Exod. xviii. 11; Num. xii. 3; Hagg. ii. 9; Eccl. iv. 9; ix. 4; 1 Sam. i. 8.

c. With *ἢ* following; as, Aristot. probl. 29, 6 *παρακαταθήκη*

¹ *Μᾶλλον* is not joined to the Superlative, and in 2 Cor. xii. 9 *ἥδιστα οὖν μᾶλλον καυχῆσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου*, the word *μᾶλλον* belongs to the whole expression *ἥδιστα καυχ.* etc., rather, then, will I glory most gladly, etc., i.e. than, repining, beseech. God to remove the *ἀσθεν.* (verse 8 f.). The word *ἥδιστα* indicates the degree of *καυχᾶσθαι*, while *μᾶλλον* forms the antithesis to what precedes.

αἰσχροὺν ἀποστερήσαι μικρὸν ἢ πολὺ δανεισάμενον (Held, Plut. Timol. 317 sq.). This, on the whole, is of rare occurrence; but the analogous βούλομαι or θέλω ἢ, *malle*, became a current phrase, 255 Her. 3. 40; Polyb. 13, 5, 3; Plut. Alex. 7; Sulla 3. This usage may be most simply explained by supposing that ἢ (owing to the Comparative construction) had come to be regarded as a proportional particle, presupposing, or to a certain extent directly expressing, a comparison; ¹ cf. Plaut. rud. 4, 4, 70 *tacita bona est mulier semper quam loquens*, Tac. ann. 3, 17.

Now, in the N. T. we find not merely θέλω ἢ 1 Cor. xiv. 19 and λυσιτελεῖ ἢ *satiùs est quam* Luke xvii. 2 (Tob. iii. 6), but, as in Greek authors (Lys. affect. tyr. 1), this use of ἢ is extended to other connections; as, Luke xv. 7 *χαρὰ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἐνὶ ἁμαρτωλῶ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενηκονταεπνέα δικαίοις* *greater joy than etc.*, cf. Num. xxii. 6 *ἰσχύει οὗτος ἢ ἡμεῖς*. With adjectives we find only a single example, but in both relations, Matt. xviii. 8 *καλὸν σοὶ ἔστιν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ κυλλόν, ἢ δύο χεῖρας . . . ἔχοντα βληθῆναι* etc. Mark ix. 43, 45. On the other hand, this construction is of frequent occurrence in the Sept., Gen. xlix. 12; Hos. ii. 7; Jon. iv. 3, 8; Lam. iv. 9; Tob. xii. 8; Ecclus. xxii. 15, and there it was suggested by the Hebrew, which also makes the comparison follow the adjective in the preposition *מִן*. In Greek authors com- 216 pare with Luke xvii. (above) *ζῆν ἀταράχως συμφέρει ἢ τὸ τρυφᾶν* ^{6th ed.} etc. Aesop. 121 de Fur. (Tob. vi. 13), in Adject. and Adv. Thuc. 6, 21 *αἰσχροὺν βιασθέντας ἀπελθεῖν ἢ ὕστερον ἐπιμεταπέμπεσθαι*, Plut. Pelop. 4 *τούτους ἂν ὀρθῶς κ. δικαίως προσαγορεύσεις συνάρχοντας ἢ ἐκείνους*, Aesop. 134 de Fur. See d'Orville, Char. p. 538; Boisson. Marini Procl. p. 78; Kypke I. 89; II. 228 and Nitsch l. c. p. 71.

Luke xviii. 14 with the reading *κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος . . . ἢ ἐκεῖνος*, would according to the preceding idiom be free from difficulty; cf. Gen. xxxviii. 26 *δεδικαίωται Θάμαρ ἢ ἐγώ* (only a comparison is not quite suitable here). All the better Codd., however, read ἢ γάρ (see also Matthäi, small ed., in loc.), which is without a parallel. Yet on Hermann's theory (followed also by Bornem. in loc.) the passage may be perhaps resolved thus: this one went away justified . . . or (went) *then the other* etc.? The γάρ must have been annexed, as elsewhere to interrogative words (also to ἢ, e.g. Xen. C. 8, 3, 40; Soph. Electr. 1212 f.), for emphasis. Probably 227 the reading in some Codd. *ἢ περ* (which in Jno. xii. 43 does not differ from ἢ) ^{7th ed.}

* ¹ The explanation given by Hermann, Vig. 884 and Schaefer. ind. Aesop. p. 138, cf. Held, Plut. Tim. p. 317, is more artificial. The earlier grammarians supplied *μᾶλλον* before the Positive.

256 is rather a correction of ἡ γάρ than the origin of it. Lehm., Tdf. in his first edition, and Mey. read παρ' ἐκείνον [so too Cod. Sin.], which would be quite free from difficulty (justified *beyond* i.e. to the neglect of the other).

3. The Comparative places over against the object compared but *one* thing as comparable, whether this one thing be an individual or a complex whole ; as, Jno. xiii. 16 οὐκ ἔστι δούλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου, v. 20 μείζονα τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, x. 29. If the Genitive annexed denotes *all* things of the same kind, as Mark iv. 31 μικρότερος πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, verse 32 ; Luke xxi. 3 ; 1 Cor. xv. 19 ; Eph. iii. 8, it is to be understood of course with the exception of the thing compared: *smaller than all* (other) *seeds* ; and the Comparative may be rendered also by the Superlative: *the smallest of all seeds*. This mode of expression occurs also in Greek authors: Demosth. falsa leg. 246 b. πάντων τῶν ἄλλων χεῖρω πολίτην, Athen. 3, 247 πάντων καρπῶν ὠφελιμώτερα, Dio Chr. 3, 39 ἀπάντων πιθανώτερος, see Jacobs, Anthol. III. 247.

In 1 Cor. xiii. 13 μείζων τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη the Comparative is not put for the Superlative ; but the meaning is: the *greater of* (among) *these is love*, and the Comparative is employed because the other two graces were regarded as forming but a *single* class in contrast with love.

4. The Comparative is not unfrequently used when the object of comparison is not expressly mentioned ; Reiz, de accent. inclin. p. 54 ; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 418, 538 ; Stallb. Phileb. p. 120 and rep. 1, 238 ; Mtth. 1021 f. ; Krü. 77.

In such cases this may ordinarily be gathered easily from the context, Jno. xix. 11 ; Acts xviii. 20 ; 1 Cor. vii. 38 (cf. vs. 36 f.) xii. 31 ; Heb. ii. 1 ; vi. 16 ; ix. 11 ; Jas. iii. 1 ; 1 Pet. iii. 7 ; or the expression has become a current phrase, as οἱ πλείονες *the majority* 217 (in an assembly), Acts xix. 32 ; xxvii. 12 ; 1 Cor. ix. 19, etc. But 651 ed. sometimes the peculiar force of the Comparative recedes still farther from view ; in such passages earlier expositors regarded the Comparative as put for the Positive¹ or Superlative: 2 Tim. i. 18 βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις thou knowest *better*, sc. than I (Lucian. pisc. 20 ἄμεινον σὺ οἶσθα ταῦτα) ; Acts xxv. 10 ὡς καὶ σὺ κύλλιον ἐπιγινώσκεις, *better* than thou art willing to appear to know it 257 (according to the supposition in verse 9 of his being guilty) ; 2 Cor. viii. 17 τὴν μὲν παράκλησιν ἐδέξατο, σπουδαιότερος δὲ ὑπάρχων *more*

¹ In Greek authors also the Comparative is not used for the Positive in sentences like Lucian. epp. Sat. 3, 32 τὸ ἥδιον καὶ συμποτικώτερον καὶ ἱσοιμῖα, etc., or 11 ὅς ἂν μεγαλοφρονέτερος αὐτῶν ἦν καὶ θρασύτερος, Her. 2, 46 etc. (*Heusing.* Plut. educ. p. 3). Cf. also *Heinichen*, Euseb. H. E. 1. 210sq. ; *Herm.* Lucian. consecr. hist. p. 204.

eager sc. than to require an exhortation ; vii. 7 ὥστε με μᾶλλον χαρῆναι *more* sc. than for the (mere) arrival of Titus (verse 6), 228 cf. verse 13 ; Acts xxvii. 13 ἄσπον παρελέγοντο τὴν Κρήτην *nearer* ^{7th ed.} sc. than (verse 8) it had been possible ; Phil. ii. 28 σπουδαιοτέρως ἐπεμψα αὐτόν sc. than I should have done, had you not been made uneasy by the news of his illness (verse 26) ; i. 12 τὰ κατ' ἐμέ μᾶλλον εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν *more* (rather) *for the advancement* sc. than, as we feared, for the hinderance ; Jno. xiii. 27 ὁ ποιεῖς ποιήσον τάχιον *more quickly* than thou seemest disposed to do, hasten the execution, see Lücke in loc. (Senec. Agamn. 965 *citius* interea mihi edissere, ubi sit gnatus, cf. *ocius* Virg. Aen. 8, 554). In 1 Tim. iii. 14 τάχιον (ἐλπίζων ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σε τάχιον) is generally rendered as the Positive (ἐν τάχει Lchm. is a correction), while some take it as equivalent to ὡς τάχιστα. The meaning is : I write this to thee, hoping (though I hope) to come to thee more quickly, sooner i.e. than thou wilt need these instructions. The reason of his writing notwithstanding, is contained in εἰς δὲ βραδύνω etc., cf. verse 15. Heb. xiii. 19 *that I may be restored to you sooner* (than would be the case without your prayers) ;¹ xiii. 23 *if he come sooner* (than the date of my departure) ; Rom. xv. 15 *τολμηρότερον ἔγραψα ὑμῖν more boldly* (frankly) sc. than, from your Christian attainment (verse 14), was necessary. On Mark ix. 42 see Fr. in loc. Acts xviii. 26 does not require explanation. In 1 Cor. vii. 38 the relation between the Positive καλῶς ποιεῖ and the Comparative κρείσσον ποιεῖ is plain from verse 36 f. Likewise *περισσότερως*, so much used by Paul, never occurs without a comparison. Its comparative force is obvious in 2 Cor. i. 12 ; ii. 4 ; vii. 13 ; xi. 23 ; Phil. i. 14 ; Gal. i. 14 ; Heb. ii. 1 ; vi. 17 ; but in 1 Thess. ii. 17 *περισσ. ἐσπουδάσαμεν τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν* etc., the ground of the comparison lies probably in the clause : ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας. The being deprived of their personal intercourse for a time (which Paul calls *being bereaved*), had made his desire stronger than it would have been had he sustained no such relation to them. In 2 Pet. i. 19 the comparative 218 force of *βεβαιώτερον* can be determined only on hermeneutical ^{6th ed.} grounds ; but the discordance even of the most recent expositors, shows how occult the reference here is. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that in 2 Pet. ii. 11 after *μεῖζονες* “ *than those* 258 *τολμηταὶ αἰθάδεις* ” ought to be supplied. On Eph. iv. 9 see Mey.

¹ Böhme, who expresses the meaning of the passage correctly in his translation, affirms nevertheless in his comments : *non est comparat. stricte intelligendus.*

Acts xvii. 21 λέγειν τι καὶ ἀκούειν καινότερον is peculiarly characteristic. The Comparative indicates that they desired to hear something *newer* (than even what was deemed *new*), and is well fitted to portray the thirst of the Athenians after news. Generally, however, the Greeks employed the Comparative (usually νεώτερον) in asking the news; thus denoting not merely something new (Positive), but something still more fresh than what
 229 had, up to that moment, been news; Her. 1, 27; Eurip. Orest. 1327;
 7th ed. Aristoph. av. 254; Theophr. ch. 8, 1; Lucian. asin. 41; D. Sic. Exc. Vat. p. 24; Plat. Protag. 310 b. and Euthyphr. c. 1, see Stallb. in loc.

In Matt. xviii. 1 (Mark ix. 34; Luke ix. 46; xxii. 14) τῶν ἄλλων at once suggests itself as the ellipsis (μέγιστος would have implied three grades of four even among the Twelve; Ramshorn, lat. Gr. 316). In the same way, in Matt. xi. 11 ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τ. οὐρ., that is, ὁ μικρότερος (τῶν) ἄλλων (the Comparative appears to be chosen here as corresponding to the preceding μέζων), cf. Diog. L. 6, 5 ἐρωτηθεὶς τί μακαριώτερον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἔφη, εὐτυχοῦντα ἀποθανεῖν, Bauer, glossar. Theod. 455; Boisson. Philostr. 491. Other expositors after μικρότερος understand Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ; see, in general, Mey. Likewise in Acts xvii. 22 κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ the particle ὡς does not appear to belong to the Comparative as an intensive, but the passage must be rendered: In all respects (at every step, as it were) I behold you as more religious people (than others are, sc. ἄλλων; the Athenians as is well known were reputed to be such; see the expositors in loc.). The word θεωρῶ was designedly chosen, compare verse 23; and θεωρεῖν ὡς, though unusual, can hardly be considered as improper.

Note 1. When it is asserted that πρῶτος is used for the Comparative (πρότερος) where only two are spoken of e.g. Rev. xxi. 1 εἶδον οὐρανὸν καινὸν ... ὁ γὰρ πρῶτος οὐρανός etc. prius coelum, Heb. x. 9 ἀναίρει τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ, Matt. xxi. 36 ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρῶτων, Acts i. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 30, the assertion is true only from a Latin point of view, for the Greeks are accustomed, even when there is a distinct reference to two only, to employ πρῶτος, δεύτερος, not πρότερος, ὑστερος (cf. Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 38), just as with us *the former, the latter* belong rather to the language of books than to that of the people. Likewise πρῶτος with the Genitive, as in Jno. i. 15, 30 πρῶτός μου (cf. Ael. anim. 8, 12), and the Adverb xv. 18 πρῶτον ὑμῶν, is properly not *prior me, prius vobis*; but the Superlative merely includes the Comparative, as is remarked by Hm. on Eurip. Med. ed. Elmsley, p. 343: Graecos ibi superlativum pro compar. dicere, ubi haec duo simul indicare volunt, et maius
 219 quid esse alio et omnino maximum. Cf. also Fr. Rom. II. 421, not. It
 6th ed. is an entire mistake when in Luke ii. 2 αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο
 259 ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, even recent expositors take πρώτη for προτέρα and make the Genitive ἡγεμον. etc. dependent on this Comparative: *took place before Q. was governor*. On this view Luke's language is not

only ambiguous (for the rendering: this took place as the first under the administration of Q. presents itself as the most obvious and natural), but also awkward if not ungrammatical. And Huschke (über d. zur Zeit d. Geburt J. Chr. gehalt. Census. Bresl. 1840, 8vo.) has not succeeded in adducing a really similar construction; he merely proves (what everybody admits) that *πρώτος* is followed by the Genitive of a noun. The error of Tholuck (Glaubwürdigk. d. evang. Geschichte, S. 184) in regarding Jer. 230 xxix. 2 in the Sept. as parallel, has been exposed by Fr., as above. 7th ed.

Note 2. Two Comparatives which are correlative, as in Rom. ix. 12 *ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι* (Sept.), cf. 1 Cor. xii. 22; 2 Cor. xii. 15; Phil. i. 23 sq., or joined with a word expressing proportion, as in Heb. i. 4 *τοσοῦτω κρείττων γενόμενος ὅσω διαφορώτερον κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα* (x. 25), require no explanation. Cf. Xen. C. 7, 5, 7; Mem. 1, 4, 10; Plato, Apol. 39 d.

In the N. T. no instance occurs of two Comparatives connected by *ἢ* (Krü. 77). On the other hand, we find Positives with *μᾶλλον* in 2 Tim. iii. 4 *φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι*.

5. Sometimes, in comparative sentences, a part is compared not with the corresponding part but with the whole (Bhdy. 432); as, Jno. v. 36 *μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου*, *witness greater than John*, that is, greater than that of John; so Her. 2, 134 *πυραμίδα καὶ οὗτος ἀπελείπετο πολλὸν ἐλάσσω τοῦ πατρός*, i.e. than that of his father; and Lucian. salt. 78 *τὰ δι' ὀμμάτων φαινόμενα πιστότερα εἶναι τῶν ὥτων δοκεῖ*. There is here no proper ellipsis (as the earlier philologists supposed); for had the speaker's thought coincided exactly with ours, he would have said *τῆς τοῦ Ἰ., τῆς τοῦ πατρός*,¹ etc. Rather must we regard the construction in question as a condensed form of expression quite in accordance with the genius of the Greek language, and of frequent occurrence, not merely with strict Comparatives (Hm. Vig. 717; Schaef. Meleſ. 127; Mtth. 1016), but also in other comparative sentences; Franke, Demosth. p. 90; Weber, Demosth. p. 399; Fr. Conjectan. I. 1 sqq. and Mr. p. 147, see § 63. In Latin, cf. Juven. 3, 74 *sermo promptus et Isaëo torrentior*, Cic. ad Brut. 1, 12; Orat. 1, 44, and in Hebrew, 260 Isa. lvi. 5 (1 Esdr. iii. 5). Matt. v. 20 *ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλείον τῶν γραμματέων* etc. may also be explained in this way without violence; (Jesus could speak of a *δικαιος. γραμμ.*, for their conduct assumed for itself this title of honor, and was looked up to and esteemed by the people as *πρῆξ*). On the other hand, 1 Cor. i. 25 *τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ σοφώτερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, is

¹ Only when several such parallel clauses follow each other is the Article omitted in the last; as, Plat. Gorg. 455 e. *ἡ τῶν λιμένων κατασκευὴ ἐκ τῆς θεμιστοκλέους ξυμβουλῆς γέγονε, τὰ δ' ἐκ τῆς Περικλέους, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ τῶν δημιουργῶν*. Cf. Sicelüs, Pausan. IV. 291.

220 easily accounted for without the usual (but forced) solution (Pott, 6th ed. Heydenreich, Flatt, in loc.): *the foolishness of God is wiser than men* (are); that is, what appears foolishness in God's arrangements is not only wisdom, but is even wiser than men, outshines all the wisdom of men.

231

7th ed.

§ 36. SUPERLATIVE.

1. Instead of the Superlative, we find, in elevated style, one instance of the Positive accompanied by a generic substantive: Luke i. 42 *εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν*, *blessed (art) thou among women*. This is primarily a Hebrew idiom (Gesen. Lg. 692) which strictly means: Among women thou art the (only) one that can be called *blessed*, the blessedness of others cannot be compared to thine; hence, with rhetorical emphasis, *highly blessed*. This is not without parallel in Greek poetry (though the passages adduced by Kühnöl are not appropriate); as, Eurip. Alcest. 473 *ὦ φίλα γυναικῶν* (*ὦ φιλάτα*) see Monk in loc., Aristoph. ran. 1081 *ὦ σκέτλι' ἀνδρῶν*, still more Pind. Nem. 3, 80 (140) *αἰετὸς ὠκύς ἐν πετανούς*, cf. also Himer. orat. 15, 4 *οἱ γενναῖοι τῶν πόνων*, and Jacobs, Ael. anim. II. 400. The case is different in Matt. xxii. 36 *ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*; *which kind of commandment is great in the law?* so that others seem insignificant in comparison, — not precisely the *greatest*, see BCrus. in loc. Likewise in Luke x. 42 *τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο*, the Positive is not put for the Superlative; the meaning is: She has chosen the *good* part (in reference to the kingdom of heaven; that which alone truly deserves *this* name); Fr. Conject. I. 19 is in error. Matt. v. 19 *ὃς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ ... οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται* will be called *great*, a great one, not exactly *the greatest* (opposed to *ἐλάχιστος* which precedes.) Cf. Hm. Aeschyl. p. 214.

2. Of the well-known Hebrew mode of expressing the Superlative, *עֲלֵיוֹתָיו*, *עֲלֵיוֹתָיו*, only the following examples occur in the N. T.: Heb. ix. 3 *ἡ (λεγομένη) ἁγία ἁγίων* *the most holy place* (which, however, as it had already assumed the character of a standing designation, scarcely comes under this head), Rev. xix. 16 *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, κύριος κυρίων*, *the highest king, lord*, 1 Tim. vi. 15. But none of these expressions is a pure Hebraism; in the Greek poets also we find such a doubling of adjectives (used substantively): Soph. Electr. 849 *δειλαία δειλαίων*, Oed. R. 466 *ἄρρη' ἄρρητων*, Soph. Phil. 65, *κακὰ κακῶν* Soph. Oed. C. 1238, see

Bhdy. 154; Wex, Antig. I. 316. The phrase βασιλεὺς βασιλέων too, is very simple, and more emphatic than ὁ μέγιστος βασιλεὺς; cf. Aeschyl. suppl. 524 ἀναξ ἀνάκτων, and, even as a technical designation, Theophan. contin. 127, 387 ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ἀρχόντων. See also Hm. Aesch. p. 230; Georgi, vind. 327 and Nova Biblioth. Lubec. II. 111 sq. In reference to the kindred expression οἱ αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων, see the passages in the concordance.

3. What were formerly adduced¹ as Hebraistic circumlocutions for the Superlative, are for the most part either,

6th ed.

a. Figurative expressions which appear in all languages (and the explanation of which in the present comes under the department of N. T. Rhetoric); e.g. Heb. iv. 12 ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον, Matt. xvii. 20 ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως the *least* faith, iv. 16 καθημένοις ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου in the *darkest* shadow. Cf. Matt. xxviii. 3; Rev. i. 14; xviii. 5. Or,

232

7th ed.

b. Constructions which have nothing to do with the Superlative; as, Col. ii. 19 αὐξήσεις τοῦ θεοῦ not a *divine*, i.e. extraordinary, increase, but God's increase, i.e. not merely acceptable to God, but produced by God (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 6); 2 Cor. i. 12 ἐν ὑπλότῳ καὶ εὐδελκρινείᾳ θεοῦ not perfect sincerity, but sincerity which God effects, produces; Jas. v. 11 τέλος κυρίου not glorious end, but the end which the Lord reserved (for Job); Rev. xxi. 11 πόλις ἔχουσα τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ not *great* glory, but simply and strictly the glory (splendor) of God; see Ewald in loc.; 1 Thess. iv. 16 σάλπιγξ θεοῦ not *great* or *far-sounding* trumpet (σάλπιγξ φωνῆς μεγάλης Matt. xxiv. 31), but trumpet of God, i.e. trumpet *which sounds at God's command*, or less restrictedly (as it is without the Article) a trumpet as used in the service of God (in heaven); so also Rev. xv. 2 κιθάραι τοῦ θεοῦ harps of God, as they sound in heaven (*to the praise of God*), cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 42.

In Rom. i. 16 δύναμις θεοῦ means, as expositors have long been agreed, the power of God (power in which God works); and there

¹ See, especially, *Passor*, Grammat. p. 298 sq. The Hebrew mode of expression בִּיטָא בִּיטָא is used likewise by the later Greek poets; see *Boisson*. Nic. Eugen. p. 134, 383. Cf. Sept. σφόδρα σφόδρα Exod. i. 12; Judith iv. 2. On the Rosetta inscription 19 we find μέγας καὶ μέγας. Essentially the same is the expression (μικρὸν) ὅσον ὅσον Heb. x. 37 a *very little while* (Hm. Vig. 726), literally, *little how very, how very!* In Greek authors it occurs with a substantive annexed, as in Aristoph. vesp. 213 ὅσον ὅσον στίχον as *big* (that is, as small) as a drop; hence it is used precisely like quantillum. The simple ὅσον occurs also with a limiting genitive in Arrian. Indic. 29, 15 στείρουσιν ὅσον τῆς χώρας. The passages adduced by *West.* and *Lösner* as parallel do not establish ὅσον ὅσον, but merely the simple μικρὸν ὅσον. On the other hand, cf. Isa. xxvi. 20.

is no ground for charging Bengel with having intended by his "magna et gloriosa" to countenance the Hebraism in question. He merely gives prominence, in his way, to two qualities which a *virtus dei* will exhibit, — referring to 2 Cor. x. 4. Lastly, ἀστέιος τῷ θεῷ Acts vii. 20, used in reference to Moses, does not express the Superlative, so much as *intensity* rather; it is to be translated *fair for* (before, in the judgment of) *God*, that is, to be sure, admodum formosus (cf. 2 Cor. x. 4 and Sturz, Zonarae glossae sacrae P. II. Grimmae, 1820, 4to. p. 12 sqq.). In Hebrew עֲתִידִים and עֲתִידִים are used in precisely the same manner (Gescn. Lg. 233 695), cf. Gen. x. 9; Jon. iii. 3 (Sept. πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ). See 5th ed. Fischer, proluss. 231 sqq.; Wolle, de usu et abusu ἀνέξσεως nomi- 222 num divinor. sacrae, in his comment. de parenthesi sacra, p. 143 sqq.; 6th ed. but the use of the *Dative* is not, in itself, to be esteemed a Hebraism, cf. Heind. Plat. Soph. 336; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 479 a.

Haab (S. 162) is quite mistaken in maintaining that even the word Χριστός, annexed to a substantive, merely gives intensity to its signification, e.g. Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 10 ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ, ἐν Χριστῷ the most unquestionable truth. So other expositors would understand Col. ii. 18 θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων as cultus perfectissimus; cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 20 σοφία ἀγγέλων.

Note. The strengthening of the Superlative by πάντων (Weber, Demosth. p. 548) occurs in the N. T. only in Mark xii. 28 πρώτη πάντων, cf. Aristoph. av. 473.

263

§ 37. NUMERALS.

1. In expressing the day of the week, εἰς is always used for the ordinal numeral πρώτος, as Matt. xxviii. 1 εἰς μίαν τῶν σαββάτων, Mark xvi. 2 πρῶτὴ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων, Luke xxiv. 1; Jno. xx. 1, 19; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2. The passages which have been quoted as analogous from Greek authors, merely prove that εἰς is used of the first member in divisions and enumerations (Weber, Demosth. p. 161), when δεύτερος or ἄλλος, or the like, follows; as Her. 4, 161; Thuc. 4, 115; Herod. 6, 5, 2 sqq. (Georgi, vindic. 54 sqq.).¹ In this case εἰς no more stands for πρώτος than in Latin unus, when followed by alter, tertius, etc., stands for primus (cf. also Rev. ix. 12 with xi. 14 and Gal. iv. 24). In the quotation from Her. 7, 11, 8 εἰς retains its proper signification, unus, and probably also in Paus. 7, 20, 1, where Sylb. renders it by una.

¹ Also Foertsch, observ. in Lysiam p. 37, has been able to adduce only passages of this kind. On Diog. L. 8, 20 see Lobeck, Aglaopham. p. 429.

² Chishull, antiq. asiat. p. 159, translates μετ' τῆς βουλῆς: die concilii prima.

The preceding use of the numeral is Hebraistic (Ewald, krit. Gr. 496 ; on the Talmud, see Wetsten. I. 544 ; in the Sept. cf. Exod. xl. 2 ; Num. i. 1, 18 ; Ezra x. 16 f. ; 2 Macc. xv. 36) and has in classical Greek a parallel in compound numerals ; as, *εἰς καὶ τριηκοστός* (Her. 5, 89) *one and thirtieth*. We, too, use in like manner the cardinal numeral in giving the year, page, etc. mainly for brevity's sake, as *in the year eighteen, page forty*, etc.

For the cardinal *one* the Singular of a substantive is sometimes used alone ; as, Acts xviii. 11 *ἐκάθισεν ἐν αὐτὸν καὶ μῆνας ἕξ* (Joseph. antt. 15, 2, 3), Rev. xii. 14 *τρέφεται ἐκεῖ καιρὸν* (but Jas. iv. 13). This, however, is not an ellipsis (cf. § 26, 1), as the number one is implied in the 7th ed. Singular. A similar usage is found in all languages.

2. In 2 Pet. ii. 5 we find an abbreviated use of the ordinal : 223 *ὄγδοον Νῶε . . . ἐφύλαξε Νῶα* as *eighth*, i.e. with seven others. 6th ed. In the same way Plat. legg. 3. 695 c. *λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἑβδομος*, Plutarch. Pelop. c. 13 *εἰς οἰκίαν δωδέκατος κατελθὼν*, Appian. Pun. p. 12 (2 Macc. v. 27), cf. also Schaef. Plutarch. V. 57 and Demosth. I. 812. Greek authors usually add *αὐτός* ; see Kypke 264 II. 442 ; Mtth. 1037.

3. Cardinals when repeated assume a *distributive* signification ; as, Mark vi. 7 *δύο δύο ἤρξατο ἀποστέλλειν*, *binos* misit, *in pairs*, two and two. Instead of this the Greeks say *κατὰ* or *ἀνὰ δύο* (Krü. 75) ; the latter¹ occurs, for instance, in Luke x. 1, and in Mark as above in Cod. D as a correction. This repetition is properly Hebraistic (see Gesen. Lg. 703 ; cf. Gen. vii. 3, 9, and thence Leo, Gramm. p. 11), and the simplest form of expressing distribution, cf. Lob. pathol. p. 184. Yet solitary instances of a similar usage occur in Greek (poetry), e.g. Aeschyl. Pers. 981 *μυρία μυρία*, i.e. *κατὰ μυριάδας* ; and the combination in Mark vi. 39, 40 *ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι πάντα συμπόσια συμπόσια . . . ἀνέπεσον πρᾶσια πρᾶσια* is analogous.

The following expressions are singular : *ἀνὰ εἰς ἕκαστος* Rev. xxi. 21 and *εἰς καθ' εἰς* (or *καθεῖς*) Mark xiv. 19 ; Jno. viii. 9 (like *ἐν καθ' ἐν*), *ὁ καθ' εἰς* Rom. xii. 5 (3 Macc. v. 34), for which Greek authors, preserving the regimen, use *καθ' ἓνα* (1 Cor. xiv. 31 ; Eph. v. 33). Yet compare *ἀνὰ τέσσαρες* Plut. Aem. 32 (see, however, Held), *εἰς καθείς* (Bekker writes *καθεῖς*) Cedren. II. 698, 723, *εἰς παρ' εἰς* Leo, Tact. 7, 83 and simply *καθεῖς* Theophan. contin. p. 39 and 101, and other quotations from late writers in

¹ For this *ἀνὰ* the Syriac version always employs the repeated numeral, e.g. Mark vi. 40 *ἀνὰ ἑκατόν* ܐܢܐ ܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ, ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ. On the other hand, we find in Act. apocryph. 92 *ἀνὰ δύο δύο*.

Wetst. I. 627, also Intpt. ad Lucian. Soloec. 9. In these phrases the preposition serves merely as an adverb; Hm. de partic. *ἄν* p. 5 sq. A different view is taken by Döderlein, Pr. de brachylogia serm. gr. et lat. (Erlang. 1831, 4to.) p. 10.

4. The well-known rule, that in combinations of numbers *καί* is commonly inserted when the smaller number precedes, but omitted when the greater precedes (Mtth. 339; cf. the Inscript. in Chishull, antiq. asiat. p. 69 sq.) cf. 1 Cor. x. 8; Jno. vi. 19; Acts i. 15; vii. 14; xxvii. 37; Rev. iv. 4; xix. 4,¹ ought not, particularly the latter part of it (Schoem. ad Isaem 332; Krü. 74), to be taken too strictly; for there are exceptions to it everywhere, in the N. T. at least several undoubted ones: Jno. ii. 20 τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἔξ ἔτεσιν (without var.), v. 5 τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη (according to preponderating authority), Gal. iii. 17; Luke xiii. 11, 16; Acts xiii. 20; Rev. xi. 2. Similar instances again and again occur in Greek authors; as, Her. 8, 1 εἴκοσι καὶ ἑπτά, Thuc. 1, 29 ἑβδόμη-
 224 κοντα καὶ πέντε, Dion. Hal. IV. 2090 ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ τρεῖς. In Sept.
 265 th ed. cf. 1 Kings ix. 28; xv. 10, 33; xvi. 23, 28; Gen. xi. 13 (in Judg. x. 4 Tdf. has given in one verse, τριάκοντα καὶ δύο υἱοὶ and τριά-
 κοντα δύο πάλους).

5. When *ἐπάνω* is joined to a cardinal to denote *above, more than*, the cardinal does not stand in the Genitive after *ἐπάνω*, but is put in the case which the verb of the sentence requires; as, Mark xiv. 5 παρῆναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων, 1 Cor. xv. 6 ὥφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς. Precisely so (without a case) the Greeks use ἔλαττον Plato, legg. 9, 856 d. μὴ ἔλαττον δέκα ἔτη γεγονότας (Thuc. 6, 95), πλέον (Paus. 8, 21, 1), περί (Zosim. 2, 30), εἰς or ἐς (Appian. civil. 2, 96, but compare Sturz, Lex. Xen. II. 68), μέχρι (Aeschin. fals. leg. 37 ed. Bremi), ὑπέρ (Plut. virt. mul. 208, Lips.; Jos. antt. 18, 1, 5); see Lob. Phryn. 410 sq.; Gieseler in Rosenmüller's Repert. II. 139 ff.; Sommer in the allg. Schulzeit. 1831, S. 963. Latin constructions such as occisis *ad* hominum millibus quatuor, Caes. b. gall. 2, 33, from the historians, are well enough known.

Note 1. That the Neuters *δύτερον, τρίτον*, etc., signify also *the second time, the third time*, etc., it is superfluous to remark. They are sometimes accompanied by *τοῦτο*, as *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι* 2 Cor. xiii. 1 *this is the third time I come*, or, *now I am coming for the third time*, cf. Her. 5, 76 *τέταρτον τοῦτο*.

Note 2. For the numeral adverb *ἑπτάκις* we find the cardinal in Matt.

¹ Three numerals are sometimes found thus combined; as, Rev. vii. 4 ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες xiv. 3; xxi. 17; Jno. xxi. 11 ἑκ. πενήκοντα τρεῖς.

xviii. 22 in the formula *ἕως ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτὰ* *seventy times seven* (times), compare in Sept. Gen. iv. 24 and *פַּעֲשֵׁי* Ps. cxix. 164 (for *פַּעֲשֵׁי פַעֲשֵׁי*) Ewald 498. Taken strictly it means: seventy times (and) seven, that is, seventy-seven times; but this would not suit the passage. Moreover, that *ἕως* is not to be joined to *ἑπτὰ* but to *ἑβδομηκ.*, appears from the preceding *ἕως ἑπτάκις*. (How variously numeral adverbs are expressed in the Sept. may be seen from the following passages: Exod. xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16; 2 Kings vi. 10; Neh. vi. 4; 2 Sam. xix. 43.)

CHAPTER IV.

236

7th ed.

THE VERB.

266

§ 38. ACTIVE AND MIDDLE VOICES.

1. As on the one hand the Active voice of transitive verbs not infrequently assumes also an intransitive (apparently reflexive) signification, so on the other many intransitive verbs have become transitives (causatives);—

225
6th ed.

Sometimes in consequence of composition, as *διαβαίνειν* Heb. xi. 29, *παρέρχεσθαι* Luke xi. 42; and sometimes by simple adaptation, as *μαθητεύειν τινά*¹ Matt. xxviii. 19 (*θριαμβεύειν τινά* 2 Cor. ii. 14?), *βασιλεύειν τινά* 1 Sam. viii. 22; 1 Kings i. 43; Isa. vii. 6; 1 Macc. viii. 13 (Lob. Soph. Aj. 385). See § 32, 1, pp. 221 sqq.

Those transitive verbs which are frequently or even generally employed as intransitive, are restricted to certain classes of meanings that may be easily gathered from the following examples: *ἄγειν* (*ἄγωμεν* let us go), *παράγειν* Matt. xx. 30; 1 Cor. vii. 31, *περιάγειν* Acts xiii. 11, *βάλλειν* Acts xxvii. 14 (precipitate itself, rush), *ἐπιβάλλειν* Mark iv. 37 (beat into), *ἀπορρίπτειν* Acts xxvii. 43 (throw themselves off), *κλίνειν* Luke ix. 12 (incline itself, decline), *ἐκκλίνειν* Rom. xvi. 17, *ἀνατέλλειν*, *βλαστάνειν*, *αὐξάνειν* (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 89 sq. 382 sqq.), *στρέφειν* Acts vii. 42, *ἀναστρέφειν* Acts v. 22 (return), and especially *ἐπιστρέφειν*; *ἐκτρέπειν*, *παράδιδόναι* Mark iv. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 23 (commit, consign one's self), *ἀπέχειν* be at a distance, *ἐπέχειν* Acts xix. 22 (hold one's self back, i.e. stay), *ὑπέρχειν*, *σπεύδειν*. In the N. T. *ἀνακάμπτειν*, *τροκόπτειν* are only intransitive. In all these cases (which are

¹ Here belongs also *προσάγειν τινά* to commission one, Acta apocr. p. 172.

for the most part verbs of motion) the Greeks considered nothing as omitted (not even *ἐαυτόν*), but the verb denotes the action absolutely: *he plunges*, Germ. *stürzt, into the sea, he turns*; where, however, as no object is mentioned, the reader can only refer the action back to the subject. See, in general, Bos, *Ellips.* p. 127 sqq. *Mth.* 1100 ff.; *Bhdy.* 339 f.; *Krü.* 134 f.; *Poppo*, *Thuc.* I. 186 Fr. Mr. p. 138. On *διδόναι* and its compounds in particular, see Jacobs, *Philostr.* p. 363, and on *παρέχειν* *Äst.* *Plat. polit.* p. 470 *Wytttenb. Plut. mor.* 1, 405.

267 *Jno.* xiii. 2 τοῦ διαβόλου βεβληκός εἰς τὴν καρδίαν must not be referred to this head, whether the received reading or that adopted by Lchm. and Tdf. be followed; *βάλλειν* has in any case an Active signification; see *Kypke*.

237 Many verbs have some of their tenses transitive (causative), and some 7th ed. intransitive. So *ἵστημι* with its compounds (*Bttm.* II. 207), of which it is sufficient to remark, that the 1st Aor. Pass. *σταθῆναι* *Mark* iii. 24 and the 1st. Fut. *σταθήσομαι* *Matt.* xii. 25, 46 share the intransitive meaning *stand*, and that in *Acts* xxvii. 28 the 1st Aor. *διαστήσαντες* [after which *γαῖαν* or *ἐαυτοὺς* is not with *Bttm.* (*Gramm. des neust. Sprachgebr.* p. 41. to be supplied)] signifies *stood off*; (cf. *Malal.* 2 p. 35 *στήσας* for *στάς*). *L. Heb.* xii. 15 Sept. *φύειν* even in the Pres. is intransitive (*Iliad.* 6, 149).

In 1 Pet. ii. 6 *περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ* is contained (stands) in the Scripture *περιέχει* appears to have rather a passive than an intransitive signification cf. *Joseph.* antt. 11, 4, 7; *Malal.* 9, 216; 18, 449; see *Krebs*, *observ.* 198.

On the impersonal use of certain verbs (in 3d pers. Sing.), as *βροντᾷ λέγει, φησί*, see § 58, 9, p. 522.

226 2. The Middle Voice (of transitive verbs)¹ refers back the action 8th ed. to the acting subject, either

¹ See *L. Küster*, de vero usu verborum medior. ap. Graecos, and *J. Clerici*, diss. de verbis Graecor. mediis, both reprinted in the work of *Dresig*, to which we refer below *Hm.* emend. rat. p. 178; *Bhdy.* 342 ff.; *Rost*, 562 ff.; *Krü.* 140 ff. are more philosophic. Especially cf. *Poppo*, Progr. de Graecor. verbis mediis, passivis, deponentibus rite discernendis. *Erft.* a. V. 1827, 4to., and *Mehlhorn's* critique on it in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 1831, I. 14 ff.; *Sommer* in *Jahn's Jahrb.* 1831, II. 36 ff.; *J. H. Kistemaker*, de origine ac vi verborum depon. et medior. gr. ling. in the *Classical Journal* No. 44 (Dec. 1820), No. 45 (March 1821). A monograph on this subject in reference to the N. T. is, *S. F. Dresigii* commentar. de verbis med. N. T. nunc prim. editus cura *J. F. Fischeri.* Lips. (1755) 1762 8vo. On the whole, however, scholars have hitherto represented too many verbs as middle; a great many such verbs, on account of the constant use of their Aorist Passive may be fairly regarded as passive, since in Greek as well as in Latin the passive may be used as reflexive. Thus in *κινέομαι, ἐγείρομαι, διακονεῖσθαι, ἀγνίεσθαι, μεθύσκεσθαι, δογματίζεσθαι* (*Col.* ii. 20), *ἀτιμάζεσθαι* *Fr.* (*Rom.* I. 72), *συσχηματίζεσθαι*, the thought is undoubtedly passive, not middle, as *moveri* etc. in Latin. Under this head come still more appropriately *ἀπτεγέσθαι* (*appetitu ferri*), *βόσκεισθαι pasci*, etc.; also *αἰσχύνεσθαι*. Compare, in general, *Rost's* preface to the third edition of his Greek Dictionary, p. 9 sqq. and his *Gramm.* p. 270. *Sommer*, as above.

a. Simply as the immediate object, as *λούομαι* *I wash myself*, *κρύπτομαι* *I conceal myself* Jno. viii. 59, *ἀπάγχομαι* *I hang myself* Matt. xxvii. 5, *παρασκευάζομαι* 1 Cor. xiv. 8;¹ or,

b. Mediately, in case the action is done *to* or in any way *for* the subject; as, *ἐξαγοράζομαι* *I buy for myself*, *πρόεχομαι* *I hold before myself* (Fr. Rom. I. 171), *νίπτομαι τὰς χεῖρας* *I wash for myself the hands, my hands* Mark vii. 3, *σπῶομαι τὴν μάχαιραν* xiv. 47, *ἐγκαλοῦμαι* Acts x. 23 *I call in to myself*, *ἀπωθέομαι* *I push away for myself* (from me). Compare besides *περιποιεῖσθαι*, *κομίζεσθαι*,^{7th ed.} *καταρτίζεσθαι*, *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* (θεόν) Fr. Rom. II. 403, and the following passages: Matt. vi. 17; Luke vi. 7; x. 11; Acts v. 2 f.; ix. 39; xviii. 18; xix. 24; xxv. 11; Gal. iv. 10; 1 Pet v. 5; 2 Thess. iii. 14; Heb. x. 5.

Sometimes a verb is used in the Active voice of material, and in the Middle of mental objects; as, *καταλαμβάνειν* *to seize*, *καταλαμβάνεσθαι* *to comprehend*, *ἀνατιθέναι* *put up*, *ἀνατίθεσθαι* *to propound*; probably also *διαβεβαιοῦσθαι* 1 Tim. i. 7; Tit. iii. 8; cf. Aristot. rhet. 2, 13. On *προβλέπεσθαι* see below, 6, p. 258.

At other times a new signification grows out of the Middle, as *πείθομαι* *I persuade myself* i.e. *obey*, *ἀπολύομαι* *solvo me* i.e. *discedo*, *παύομαι* *I cease*, *φυλάσσομαι τινα* *I guard one in reference to myself* i.e. *I beware of him*;² thoroughly transitive are *παραιτοῦμαι τι* (*I deprecate something in my own behalf*) *I decline*, *αἰροῦμαι* *I*²²⁷ *take for myself, I choose*, *ἀπειπάμην τι* *I renounced* 2 Cor. iv. 2,^{6th ed.} *ἐκτρέπομαι τι* 1 Tim. vi. 20, *ἀποδίδομαι τι* (*I give away something from myself*) *I sell something*; *ἀποκρίνομαι* (*I give out a decision from myself*) *I answer*, *ἐπικαλοῦμαι καίσαρα* Acts xxv. 11 (*I call upon the emperor in my behalf*) *I appeal to*. So *λυτρόω* properly

¹ What verbs regularly express this reflexive meaning by the Middle must be learned from observation. In many (we should rather say in most, see *Rost* 563), the reflexive sense is never expressed by the Middle, but by the reflexive pronoun *ἑαυτὸν* etc. subjoined, see *Buttm.* 122, 2. Thus in Matt. viii. 4 *δεικνύειν ἑαυτὸν* is used to denote *show himself*; cf. Her. 3, 119; *ἀποκτείνειν ἑαυτὸν* is always employed to express *kill himself* (Jno. viii. 22); cf. further, Jno. xxi. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 4; 1 Jno. i. 8 (in contrast with a passive Matt. xxiii. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 31, or an active Luke ix. 25; xxiii. 35), see *Küster*, de verb. med. p. 56. Lexicographers should no longer defer an accurate investigation of the subject. See also *Porppo.* as above, p. 2, note; *Krū.* 146.

² *φυλάσσεσθαι* as a Middle means also *sibi (aliquid) custodire* (*Heind.* Plat. Gorg. p. 323), and was used of that which one retains in his mind, by Hesiod. op. 263, 561. On the other hand, in the sense of (*legem*) *sibi observare*, as in Luke xviii. 21 according to the reading of several Codd. (*ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητος*), it probably does not occur in classical Greek, but frequently in the Sept. Yet in Luke xviii. 21 the better reading [sustained by Cod. Sin. also] is *ἐφύλαξα*.

means I liberate, acting as master; but *λυτροῦμαι* I liberate *for myself* another's captive, Luke xxiv. 21.

When such Middle verb is construed with the accusative of any thing or quality belonging to the subject, the pronoun is sometimes in the N. T. added to the substantive; as, Matt. xv. 2 οὐ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν Rom. ix. 17 ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου (in Greek authors ἐπιδείκνυμαι is often so used, Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 9; Schoem. a 269 Plutarch. Agid. p. 144), Acts vii. 58 ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν (where Td without sufficient authority omits the pronoun), Heb. vi. 17; Eph. ii. 7 1 Pet. iv. 19. In such instances the pronoun is redundant, and Greek authors usually dispense with it, which the N. T. writers also frequently do, as in Acts ix. 39; Mark vii. 3; xiv. 47.

By the usage under b. is likewise 2 Cor. iii. 18 ἡμεῖς πάντες . . . τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι to be explained: as it were *sibi* intueri, beholding (for ourselves) the glory of the Lord (as in a mirror), like Philo II. 10. In Rom. iii. 25 ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς etc., recent expositors have likewise taken notice of the Middle; yet Philippi seems to have reached the true exposition more nearly than Fr.

3. Finally, c. the Middle frequently denotes an action that takes place by order or with the permission of the subject, — a relation 239 expressed in German by the auxiliary verb (*sich*) *lassen*, and in 7th ed Latin usually by *curare* (cf. Sommer in Seebode, krit. Bibliothek 1828, II. 733); as, ἀδικεῖσθαι to *allow* one's self to be wronged and ἀποστερεῖσθαι to *allow* one's self to be robbed (both in 1 Cor. vi. 7), ἀπογράφεσθαι to *allow* one's self to be registered, *get* enrolled Luke ii. 1. Cf. further βαπτίζεσθαι, γαμίζεσθαι, and many other. Examples of Middle verbs that in this case, too, assume a new and independent transitive signification, are: δανείζομαι pecuniam mutuo dandam sibi curare i.e. *mutuam sumere* Matt. v. 42, μισθομαι allow something to be hired out to one's self i.e. *hire* Matt. xx. 7.

In some Middle verbs the *reciprocal* meaning is combined with the reflexive (Krü. 143); as, βουλευέσθαι to *consult with one another* Jno. xi. 10, συντίθεσθαι to *settle, agree, among themselves* Jno. ix. 22, κρίνεσθαι *be law, have a lawsuit* 1 Cor. vi. 1 (in the quotation from the O. T. in Rom. iii. 4 also?).

4. Although the import of the Middle is sharply defined and peculiar, yet in practice, even among the best Greek authors, the forms of the Middle often blend with those of the Passive; — not merely,

a. That those tenses which have no separate form in the Middle are borrowed from the Passive (the Present, Imperf., Perf., Pluperf.)

see Bttm. I. 368), and that the 1st Aor. Passive in several verbs ²²⁸ serves at the same time as 1st Aor. Middle, as in φοβείσθαι, ^{8th ed.} κοιμᾶσθαι, πορεύεσθαι, ἀγνίζεσθαι (Acts xxi. 24, 26; cf. also § 39, 2); but

b. Some tenses peculiar to the Middle assume a Passive signification. These are the Future (Monk, Eurip. Hippol. p. 169, Lips.; Boisson. Eunap. p. 336; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 192; Stallb. Plat. Crit. 16 and rep. II. 230; Isocrat. Areopag. ed. Benseler, p. 229; Weber, Demosth. p. 353);¹ and, though far more rarely and, ²⁷⁰ especially in prose, not beyond question, the Aorist (d'Orville, Charit. p. 358; Abresch, Aristaen. p. 178; Mtth. 1107 and ad Eurip. Hel. 42; yet cf. Schaef. Gnom. 166; Lob. 320).

This usage, it has been thought, occurs in the N. T.: Gal. v. 12 *ὁφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατούντες ὑμᾶς*, yet here the Middle affords a very good sense (see my Com. in loc.); 1 Cor. x. 2 *καὶ πάντες ἐβαπτίσαντο*, which, however, (see Mey.) may be very suitably rendered: *they all allowed themselves to be baptized* (the reading *ἐβαπτίσθησαν*, which is found in very good Codd. [Sin. also], is probably an emendation); the same applies to 1 Cor. vi. 11 *ἀπελούσασθε*. In Acts xv. 22 *ἐκλεξαμένους*, even if it were to be joined to *ἄνδρας*, would not be equivalent to *ἐκλεχθέντας* (see Kühnöl in loc.; Schwarz, Comm. p. 499), but would retain the Middle signification: who *suffered* themselves to be chosen, who ²⁴⁰ (voluntarily) accepted the mission; (*ἐκλεχθέντας* would mean: ^{7th ed.} who were chosen, even *without their consent*).² But it is more probable that *ἐκλεξαμένους* should be referred to *ἀπόστολοι* and *πρεσβύτεροι*, and translated: *after they had chosen from among themselves persons*; see Elsner, observ. I. 429. Cf. § 63, I. 1, p. 567.

5. The Active is sometimes employed in Greek authors where the Middle form might have been expected, (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 185; Locella, Xen. Eph. p. 233; Bttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 161; Siebelis, Pausan. I. 5; Weber, Demosth. 252 sq.). From the N. T., however, the following passage has been erroneously referred to this head: 2 Cor. xi. 20 *εἴ τις ὑμᾶς καταδουλοῖ* if one brings you into bondage unto himself (sibi) (Gal. ii. 4, Middle as a var.). The Apostle wished to say generally: *if he brings you into bondage*, makes you slaves. He speaks merely of enslavement; to *whom* and *how*,

¹ According to *Sommer*, as above, the Fut. Middle was itself, perhaps, originally Passive, and afterwards, on account of its more convenient form, preferred to the Fut. Pass. Cf. *Roet*, 561 f.

² So perhaps Plutarch, orator. vit. 7 (V. 149, Lips.) *πιστευσάμενος τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν χρημάτων*.

- must be gathered from the context. Likewise, in Luke xii. 20 the Active is used with strict propriety: *ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ they require of thee* (where only the taking away of the *ψυχὴ* was to be expressed). On the other hand we sometimes find, at least in the text. recept., *ποιεῖν*, where classic Greek authors would have employed *ποιεῖσθαι*¹ (Küster, p. 37 sqq. 67 sqq.; Dresig, p. 401 sqq.; 229 Krü. 141), e.g. *συνωμοσίαν ποιεῖν* Acts xxiii. 13 (Polyb. 1, 70, 6; 6th ed. Herod. 7, 4, 7), *μονὴν ποιεῖν* Jno. xiv. 23 (Thuc. 1, 131 and Poppo), 271 *πρόθεσιν ποιεῖν* Eph. iii. 11;² but in the first two passages Lchm. has restored the Middle. Likewise *εὑρίσκειν* is used in the meaning of *consequi* for *εὑρίσκεισθαι*, see Fr. Mt. p. 390.³
- 241 Occasionally the Middle and Active are used interchangeably,⁴ 7th ed. as Luke xv. 6 *συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους*, vs. 9 *συγκαλεῖται τὰς φίλας* etc. according to Lchm. (Tdf. has the Active here also);⁵ it depended here on the writer (Franke, Demosth. p. 95), whether he would say, *called together to himself*, or generally, *called together*, — the latter being perfectly intelligible. Compare also Jas. iv. 2 f. *αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε*, 1 Jno. iii. 22; cf. v.

¹ In Mark ii. 23 *ὁδὸν ποιεῖν* (where Codd. vary) is probably not put for *ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι* Her. 7, 42 (according to *πορείαν ποιεῖσθαι* Luke xiii. 22), as the meaning *make a journey* is here rather unsuitable. The translation must be quite literal: they made by plucking ears a pathway in the field. Lchm. in accordance with his theory has printed *ὁδοποιεῖν*, after B.

² The Middle of *ποιεῖν* seldom occurs in the N. T. (almost exclusively in the Acts and Paul's Epistles), but then it always clearly exhibits a Middle signification. As the lexicons do not usually distinguish the Middle and Active, we shall here annex the phrases in which the Middle occurs: Acts i. 1 *τὸν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιήσαμην*, viii. 2 *ἐποίησαντο κοπετόν*, xxv. 17 *ἀναβολὴν ποιεῖσθαι*, xxvii. 18 *ἐκβολὴν ποιεῖσθαι*, Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4 *μνείαν τινὸς ποιεῖσθαι*, 2 Pet. i. 15 *μνήμην τινὸς ποιεῖσθαι*, i. 10 *ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι βεβαίαν*, Jude 3 *σπουδὴν ποιεῖσθαι*, Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1 *δέησιν ποιεῖσθαι*, Rom. xv. 26 *κοινωνίαν ποιεῖσθαι*, Eph. iv. 16 *τὸ σῶμα τὴν ἀξίαν ποιεῖται*, Heb. i. 3 *δι' ἐαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*. To illustrate Greek usage much has been collected by Dresig, p. 422 sqq.; see also V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 538 sq. The distinction between the Act. and the Mid. has been stated by Blume, ad Lycurg. p. 55, thus: Est *ποιεῖν*, quotiescunque accusativus substantivi abstracti accedit, *aliquid efficere, parare, faciendum curare, causare, bring to pass, institute, ποιεῖσθαι ipsum facere* cum substantivis junctum periphrasin facit verbi, quod aut notatione aut certe notione nomini apposito conveniat. (On *λόγον ποιεῖν* and *ποιεῖσθαι*, see Weber, Demosth. p. 295.)

³ In Jno. v. 5 *ἦν ἄνθρωπος ... τριάκ. καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ* it cannot be said that *ἔχων* is put for *ἐχόμενος*. Rather might *ἔχειν ἐν ἀσθεν.* be considered as equivalent to *ἔχειν ἀσθενῶς (κακῶς)*. But according to verse 6 *ἔχων* is probably to be joined as transitive to *ἔτη*.

⁴ The distinction between the Active and the Middle is forcibly marked e.g. in Dion. H. IV. 2088 *τὸν τε ἀετὸν ἀνεσωσάμην, καὶ τὸν στρατοπεδάρχην ἔσωσα*.

⁵ In the same way along with *καταλαμβάνεσθαι πόλιν*, etc. (to capture, take possession of), *καταλαμβάνειν πόλιν* is also used; cf. Schweighäuser, Lexic. Polyb. p. 330.

14 f.¹ See Mtth. 1096 (Foerster, Lys. p. 39).² In 1 Cor. ix. 5 *περι-
άγεσθαι* might be more appropriate. *Περιάγειν τινά* signifies to 272
lead about for exhibition, or to conduct, 2 Macc. vi. 10; Pol. 12, 4, 230
14; but to lead about *with one* (in one's company), is expressed 6th ed.
by *περιάγεσθαι*. However, the Active is used perhaps in this sense
in Xen. C. 2, 2, 28. Moreover, it would not be surprising that
foreigners, not possessing in such matters the delicate perception of
native Greeks, should sometimes fail to observe the precise shade
of meaning conveyed by the Middle voice; particularly as, even
among natives, its use appears to have often depended on the
culture and taste of individual writers. *Καθύπτω*, an Active alto-
gether peculiar to the later language (see Passow), stands for the
Middle in Acts xxviii. 3 (yet not without var.).

In such cases as Matt. xxvi. 65 *διέρρηξε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ*, Acts xiv. 14,
the expression *διερρήξατο τὰ ἱμάτια* might also have been used in Greek,
see above; yet the former is not an anomaly, Bhdy. 348. The distinction
between *παρέχειν* and *παρέχεσθαι* (Rost, 564; Krü. 141; cf. Küster, No. 49)
is not uniformly observed even by the Greeks; yet the suitableness of the
Middle will be easily recognized in Acts xix. 24; Col. iv. 1; Tit. ii. 7, and
in Acts xvi. 16 *ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρείχε τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς μαντευομένη*
the Active is more appropriate than the Middle, as the writer is speaking
of a gain which the damsel procured actually only, not designedly.

6. On the other hand, the Middle occurs with *ἐαυτῷ* Jno. xix. 24 242
διεμερίσαντο ἑαυτοῖς (for which we find in Matt. xxvii. 35 *διεμερίσαντο* 7th ed.
alone), cf. Xen. C. 1, 4, 13; 2, 1, 30; Lycurg. 11, 8; 17, 3, and
with *ἐαυτόν*, instead of the Active with *ἐαυτόν* (Plat. Protag. p. 349a.;
Blume, Lycurg. p. 90). In Tit. ii. 7 *σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον*
the use of the Middle in the sense of *prove one's self* (in any mental
or moral quality) was so established, that the writer employed it
even where *σεαυτόν* (on account of *τύπον*) had to be distinctly
expressed; cf. Xen. C. 8, 1, 39 *παράδειγμα . . . τοιόνδε ἐαυτόν παρεί-
χετο*. For other examples of the Middle with *ἐαυτῷ*, *ἐαυτόν*, see
Schaefer. Dion. Hal. p. 88; Bornem. Xen. Anab. 76 sq.; Bhdy. 347;

¹ In Mark xiv. 47 we find *σπασόμενος τὴν μάχαιραν*, but in Matt. xxvi. 51 *ἀπέσπασε
τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ*.

² Under this head might be classed also those Actives, accompanied by the reflexive
pronoun, for which the Middles are also actually in use in a reflexive sense; as, *ταπεινοῦν
ἑαυτόν* Phil. ii. 8; Matt. xviii. 4 cf. *ταπεινοῦσθαι* Jas. iv. 10 (West. II. 271), *δουλοῦν
ἑαυτόν* 1 Cor. ix. 19, *ζωννύειν ἑαυτ.* Jno. xxi. 18, *γυμνάζειν ἑαυτ.* 1 Tim. iv. 7 etc. But
in all these passages the reflexive pronoun is employed antithetically (Krü. 146), and
in Jno. xxi. e.g. the Mid. would even be incorrect. So *κείρειν ἑαυτ.* would mean, shear
himself; *κείρεσθαι* shear himself. Besides, the Active with *ἐαυτόν* was probably chosen
where the identity of the Passive and Middle forms would have occasioned ambiguity.

- must be gathered from the context. Likewise, in Luke xii. 20 the Active is used with strict propriety: ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ *they require of thee* (where only the taking away of the ψυχή was to be expressed). On the other hand we sometimes find, at least in the text. recept., ποιεῖν, where classic Greek authors would have employed ποιῆσθαι¹ (Küster, p. 37 sqq. 67 sqq.; Dresig, p. 401 sqq.; Krü. 141), e.g. συνωμοσίαν ποιεῖν Acts xxiii. 13 (Polyb. 1, 70, 6; 229 ^{7th ed.} Herod. 7, 4, 7), μονὴν ποιεῖν Jno. xiv. 23 (Thuc. 1, 131 and Poppo), 271 ^{7th ed.} πρὸθεσιν ποιεῖν Eph. iii. 11;² but in the first two passages Lchm. has restored the Middle. Likewise εὐρίσκειν is used in the meaning of *consequi* for εὐρίσκεισθαι, see Fr. Mt. p. 390.³
- 241 Occasionally the Middle and Active are used interchangeably,⁴ as Luke xv. 6 συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους, vs. 9 συγκαλεῖται τὰς φίλας etc. according to Lchm. (Tdf. has the Active here also);⁵ it depended here on the writer (Franko. Demosth. p. 95), whether he would say, *called together to himself*, or generally, *called together*, — the latter being perfectly intelligible. Compare also Jas. iv. 2 f. αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, 1 Jno. iii. 22; cf. v.

¹ In Mark ii. 23 ὁδὸν ποιεῖν (where Codd. vary) is probably not put for ὁδὸν ποιῆσθαι Her. 7, 42 (according to πορεύειν ποιῆσθαι Luke xiii. 22), as the meaning *make a journey* is here rather unsuitable. The translation must be quite literal: they made by plucking ears a pathway in the field. Lchm. in accordance with his theory has printed ὁδοποιεῖν, after B.

² The Middle of ποιεῖν seldom occurs in the N. T. (almost exclusively in the Acts and Paul's Epistles), but then it always clearly exhibits a Middle signification. As the lexicons do not usually distinguish the Middle and Active, we shall here annex the phrases in which the Middle occurs: Acts i. 1 τὸν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιήσαμην, viii. 2 ἐποίησαντο κοπετόν, xxv. 17 ἀναβολὴν ποιῆσθαι, xxvii. 18 ἐκβολὴν ποιῆσθαι, Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4 μνείαν τινὸς ποιῆσθαι, 2 Pet. i. 15 μνήμην τινὸς ποιῆσθαι, i. 10 ἐκλογὴν ποιῆσθαι βεβαίαν, Jude 3 σπουδὴν ποιῆσθαι, Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1 δέησιν ποιῆσθαι, Rom. xv. 26 κοινωνίαν ποιῆσθαι, Eph. iv. 16 τὸ σῶμα τὴν ἀβύσσιν ποιεῖται, Heb. i. 3 δι' ἐαυτοῦ καθορισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. To illustrate Greek usage much has been collected by Dresig, p. 422 sqq.; see also V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 538 sq. The distinction between the Act. and the Mid. has been stated by Blume, ad Lycurg. p. 55, thus: Est ποιεῖν, quotiescunque accusativus substantivi abstracti accedit, aliquid efficere, parare, faciendum curare, causare, bring to pass, institute, ποιῆσθαι ipsum facere cum substantivis junctum periphrasin facit verbi, quod aut notatione aut certe notione nomini appposito conveniat. (On λόγον ποιεῖν and ποιῆσθαι, see Weber, Demosth. p. 295.)

³ In Jno. v. 5 ἦν ἄνθρωπος . . . τριάκ. καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ it cannot be said that ἔχων is put for ἐχόμενος. Rather might ἔχειν ἐν ἀσθεν. be considered as equivalent to ἔχειν ἀσθενῶς (κακῶς). But according to verse 6 ἔχων is probably to be joined as transitive to ἔτη.

⁴ The distinction between the Active and the Middle is forcibly marked e.g. in Dion. H. IV. 2088 τὸν τε ἀετὸν ἀνεσωσάμενον, καὶ τὸν στρατοπεδάρχην ἔσωσα.

⁵ In the same way along with καταλαμβάνεσθαι πόλιν, etc. (to capture, take possession of), καταλαμβάνειν πόλιν is also used; cf. Schweighäuser, Lexic. Polyb. p. 330.

14 f.¹ See Mtth. 1096 (Foertsch, Lys. p. 39).² In 1 Cor. ix. 5 *περι-
αγεσθαι* might be more appropriate. *Περιάγειν τινά* signifies to 272
lead about for exhibition, or to conduct, 2 Macc. vi. 10; Pol. 12, 4, 230
14; but to lead about *with one* (in one's company), is expressed ^{6th ed.}
by *περιάγεσθαι*. However, the Active is used perhaps in this sense
in Xen. C. 2, 2, 28. Moreover, it would not be surprising that
foreigners, not possessing in such matters the delicate perception of
native Greeks, should sometimes fail to observe the precise shade
of meaning conveyed by the Middle voice; particularly as, even
among natives, its use appears to have often depended on the
culture and taste of individual writers. *Καθόπτω*, an Active alto-
gether peculiar to the later language (see Passow), stands for the
Middle in Acts xxviii. 3 (yet not without var.).

In such cases as Matt. xxvi. 65 *διέρρηξε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ*, Acts xiv. 14,
the expression *διέρρηξεν τὰ ἱμάτια* might also have been used in Greek,
see above; yet the former is not an anomaly, Bhdy. 348. The distinction
between *παρέχειν* and *παρέχεσθαι* (Rost, 564; Krü. 141; cf. Küster, No. 49)
is not uniformly observed even by the Greeks; yet the suitableness of the
Middle will be easily recognized in Acts xix. 24; Col. iv. 1; Tit. ii. 7, and
in Acts xvi. 16 *ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρέιχε τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς μαντευομένη*
the Active is more appropriate than the Middle, as the writer is speaking
of a gain which the damsel procured actually only, not designedly.

6. On the other hand, the Middle occurs with *ἐαυτῷ* Jno. xix. 24 ²⁴²
διεμερίσαντο ἐαυτοῖς (for which we find in Matt. xxvii. 35 *διεμερίσαντο* ^{7th ed.}
alone), cf. Xen. C. 1, 4, 13; 2, 1, 30; Lycurg. 11, 8; 17, 3, and
with *ἐαυτόν*, instead of the Active with *ἐαυτόν* (Plat. Protag. p. 349a.;
Blume, Lycurg. p. 90). In Tit. ii. 7 *σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον*
the use of the Middle in the sense of *prove one's self* (in any mental
or moral quality) was so established, that the writer employed it
even where *σεαυτόν* (on account of *τύπον*) had to be distinctly
expressed; cf. Xen. C. 8, 1, 39 *παράδειγμα . . . τοιόνδε ἐαυτόν παρέ-
χετο*. For other examples of the Middle with *ἐαυτῷ*, *ἐαυτόν*, see
Schac. Dion. Hal. p. 88; Bornem. Xen. Anab. 76 sq.; Bhdy. 347;

¹ In Mark xiv. 47 we find *σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν*, but in Matt. xxvi. 51 *ἀπέσπασε
τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ*.

² Under this head might be classed also those Actives, accompanied by the reflexive
pronoun, for which the Middles are also actually in use in a reflexive sense; as, *ταπεινοῦν
ἐαυτόν* Phil. ii. 8; Matt. xviii. 4 cf. *ταπεινούσθαι* Jas. iv. 10 (*Welst.* II. 271), *δουλοῦν
ἐαυτόν* 1 Cor. ix. 19, *ζωνύειν ἐαυτ.* Jno. xxi. 18, *γυμνάζειν ἐαυτ.* 1 Tim. iv. 7 etc. But
in all these passages the reflexive pronoun is employed antithetically (Krü. 146), and
in Jno. xxi. e.g. the Mid. would even be incorrect. So *κτείνειν ἐαυτ.* would mean, shear
himself, *κτεπεσθαι* shear himself. Besides, the Active with *ἐαυτόν* was probably chosen
where the identity of the Passive and Middle forms would have occasioned ambiguity.

Mchlhorn, as above, 36; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 189; cf. also Epiphanius I. 380 *ὀπλισάμενος ἑαυτὸν*. In Tit. i. 5 *ἐπιδιορθώση*, according to the received text (where, however, better Codd. have *ἐπιδιορθώσης*), would be exactly equivalent to the Active. As little can a Middle signification be recognized in *ἀπεκδύεσθαι* Col. ii. 15, *ἀμύνεσθαι* 273 Acts vii. 24 (cf. Dion. H. I. 548), *ἀρμόξεσθαι* 2 Cor. xi. 2 (Lösner, Observ. p. 320 sq.). Perhaps also *προέχεσθαι* Rom. iii. 9 is used for the Active. Similar instances occur in later writers, Schaefer, Plutarch. V. 101; Meineke, Index ad Cinnam. 244.¹ To this head are referred also Eph. v. 13 *πάν τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστι*, and i. 23 *τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου*. But in the first passage *φανερούσθαι* occurs immediately before as a Passive, and the apostle continuing his argument connects *φανερούμενον* with 231 *φανεροῦνται*; the former, therefore, must be taken in the same sense 6th ed. with the latter, as Harless and Mey. in loc. have explained: *all things when reprov'd are made manifest by the light, for everything that is made manifest is light*. In i. 23 *πληρουμ.* might also be taken in a Passive sense (as has been done by Holzhausen); but then, as Harless has well shown, *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι* would create difficulty. I take *πληρούσθαι*, therefore, as Middle (Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 56; 6, 2, 14; Demosth. Polycl. 707 b.), *the fulness of him who filleth all*, where the Middle signification is not entirely lost: *from himself, with himself*, he filleth all. Likewise in Heb. xi. 40 the Middle *προβλέπεσθαι* is employed correctly: *προβλέπειν* would be the bodily act of *seeing beforehand*; the Middle expresses the act of mental *providing*. (Similar is the distinction in Greek authors between *προορᾶσθαι* and *προϊδέσθαι*.)

A distinction between the use of the Act. and Mid. appears in the verb *ἐνεργεῖν*, the Active of which is used by Paul of personal action (1 Cor. xii. 6; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. i. 11, etc.), and the Middle of non-personal (Rom. vii. 5; Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. ii. 7, etc.). Hence in 1 Thess. ii. 13 *ὁ*; must not be referred to *θεός* but to *λόγος*.

243 7. From Middle verbs are to be carefully distinguished Deponent. 7th ed. These, under a Passive (or Middle) form, have a transitive or a neuter signification; and their Active forms either do not occur at all (in prose), or have, by usage, exactly the same meaning (Rost 267.);² as, *δύνασθαι*, *δωρεῖσθαι*, *γίγνεσθαι*, *βιάζεσθαι*, *ἐντέλ-*

¹ In the passages selected by Schweighäuser, Lexic. Herod. II. 185, the distinctive import of the Middle Voice can be for the most part detected.

² Only in later authors do we find e.g. the Active of *λυμάλνεσθαι*, see Passow. On the other hand, the Active of *δωρεῖσθαι* occurs even in Pindar, Olymp. 6, 131. In the N. T. we find even *εὐαγγελίζω*, as frequently in the Sept.

εσθαι, εὔχεσθαι, ἐνθυμείσθαι, ἐργάζεσθαι, εὐλαβεῖσθαι, μάχεσθαι, ἐμψέσθαι, φείδεσθαι, ἀσπάζεσθαι, ἔρχεσθαι, ἡγείσθαι, ἰᾶσθαι, λογίζεσθαι, προαιτιάσθαι, and many others. With regard to Deponents 274 it must be remarked that,

a. Though most of them have in the Aorist the Middle form (Middle Deponents, as αἰτιάσθαι, ἀσπάζεσθαι, ἐργάζεσθαι, φείδεσθαι), yet not a few have in that tense the Passive (Passive Deponents), as βούλεσθαι, δύνασθαι, ἐπιμελείσθαι, εὐλαβεῖσθαι, σπλαγχνίζεσθαι, κωμᾶσθαι, etc.

b. Others combine both forms, though then (in prose) either the one form or the other predominates. Among these is ἀρνέεισθαι, on which (in opposition to Bttm.) see Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 209. In the N. T. only its Aor. Mid. ἡρνητάμην occurs, which in Greek prose authors is precisely the rarer form. On the other hand, διαλέγεσθαι has always the Passive Aor. in biblical Greek.

c. Sometimes in Middle Deponents, along with the Aor. (or Perf.) Mid. (with an Active signification), the Aor. or the Perf. Pass. with a Passive signification is in use; as, ἐθεάθην Matt. vi. 1; Mark xvi. 11 (Thuc. 3, 38) cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 594 sq., along with ἐθεασάμην I saw; ἰάθην Matt. viii. 13; Luke vi. 17 (Isa. liii. 5; Plat. legg. 6, 758 d.) and ἴαμαι Mark v. 29 (on the other hand, 232 ἀσάμην Active); ἐλογίσθην often (cf. Xen. C. 3, 1, 33), ἀπεδέχθησαν 6th ed. Acts xv. 4 (Aor. Mid. Luke viii. 40; Acts xviii. 27) cf. 2 Macc. iii. 9., ἀπαρητημένος Luke xiv. 19 (Aor. Mid. Heb. xii. 19, 25), ἐβρύσθην 2 Tim. iv. 17 (Aor. Mid. Col. i. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 7, etc.), ἐχαρίσθην 1 Cor. ii. 12; Phil. i. 29 (Pluperfect, Her. 8, 5; Aor. Mid. often in N. T., see, in general, Rost, p. 566).

d. The Fut. Pass. of λογίζομαι with a Passive meaning occurs in Rom. ii. 26, likewise ἰαθήσεται Matt. viii. 8, ἀπαρνηθήσομαι Luke xii. 9. Even the Pres. of the first of these is used passively, Rom. iv. 5, cf. Eccclus. xl. 19 (not 2 Cor. x. 2); so also of βιάζεσθαι Matt. xi. 12, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 184; III. I. 31.

e. The Perf. Pass. εἰργασμαι is sometimes used actively 2 Jno. 8 (Demosth. Conon. 728 a. Xen. M. 2, 6, 6; Lucian. fugit. 2), and sometimes passively Jno. iii. 21 (Xen. M. 3, 10, 9; Plat. rep. 8, 366 a.) Rost, as above. On the other hand, ἡρνημαι 1 Tim. v. 8, ἀντέταλμαι Acts xiii. 47 (Herod. 1, 9, 23; Pol. 17, 2, 1; 1 Sam. xxi. 2; Tob. v. 1, etc.), and δέδεγμαι Acts viii. 14, have only an Active meaning. See, in general, Bttm. II. 51; Bhdy. 341, but especially Poppo in the programme mentioned above, and Rost, Gramm. S. 266 ff.

That among verbs usually called Deponent there are many to be regarded as Middle, has been noticed by Rost, Gramm. S. 268 f. and Mehlhorn, as above, S. 39. With regard to πολιτεύεσθαι this is already admitted. But κτάομαι *I acquire for myself*, ἀγωνίζομαι (Rost 268), βιάζεσθαι, μεγαλυνεῖσθαι, and perhaps δέχομαι, ἀσπάζομαι (according to Passow Deponent Middle), should be also considered as Middle, as in all of them a reflexive meaning is more or less apparent. Πληροῦσθαι Eph. i. 23 is likewise. [in 1st and 2d ed.; not so in 3d] called a Deponent, but improperly. Ὑστερεῖσθαι occurs only in the N. T. as synonymous with the Active. Lastly, μαίνομαι as well as ἡττάομαι must, as among the Greeks, be taken Passively; Sommer, as above, p. 36.

§ 39. THE PASSIVE.

1. When a verb governing the Gen. or Dat. of a person, as πιστεύειν τινί, κατηγορεῖν τινος, is construed in the Passive, the Greeks generally make the noun denoting the person the Subject (Krü. 137); as,

a. Gal. ii. 7 πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον i.e. πεπιστευμένον ἔχω τὸ εὐαγγ. (Actively πιστεύειν τινί τι), Rom. iii. 2 ἐπιστεύθησαν (the Jews vs. 1) τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ix. 17 οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι, cf. Diog. L. 7, 34 πιστευθέντες τὴν ἐν Περγὰμφ βιβλιοθήκην, Poet. 3, 69, 1 πεπιστευμένος τὴν πόλιν παρὰ Ῥωμαίων, 31, 26, 7; Herod. 7, 9, 7; Demosth. Theocr. 507 c.; Appian. civ. 2, 136; Strabo 17, 197; 17, 797, and often. Likewise, in the signification to believe *some one* (πιστεύειν τινί), the Passive πιστεύομαι signifies *I am believed*,¹ e.g. Xen. A. 7, 6, 33; Isocr. Trapez. p. 874; Demosth. 233 Callip. 720 a., βασιλεύομαι Aristot. Nic. 8, 11. It is otherwise in 6th ed. 1 Tim. iii. 16 ἐπιστεύθη (Χριστὸς) ἐν κόσμῳ, which cannot be referred to πιστεύειν Χριστῷ, but presupposes the phrase πιστεύειν Χριστόν, as in 2 Thess. i. 10 ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν is referable to πιστεύειν τι, 1 Juo. iv. 16. Under this head come also the following passages: Acts xxi. 3 ἀναφανέντες τὴν Κύπρον when appeared in sight, i.e. ἀναφανείσαν ἔχοντες τὴν Κ., Heb. xi. 2 ἐκ ταύτης ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι (μαρτυρεῖν τινί), Acts xvi. etc., Heb. xiii. 16 εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός (Bleek in loc.), likewise viii. καθὼς κεχηματίσται Μωϋσῆς (Matt. ii. 12, 22; Joseph. antt. 3, 8, 8 and Matt. xi. 5 (Luke vii. 22) πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, Heb. iv. 2—the latter passages because the construction εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τινί (see 276 Fr. Mtth. p. 395) and χρηματίζειν τινί (Joseph. antt. 10, 1, 3; 11

¹ The reverse ἀπιστοῦμαι Wisd. xii. 17.

3, 4) is the usual one; probably also Col. ii. 20 *τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε* (*δογματίζειν τινί* 2 Macc. x. 8) see Mey. In 3 Jno. 12 the Passive *μαρτυρεῖσθαι* is construed also with the Dative of a person.

b. Of verbs governing the Genitive, only the Passive *κατηγοροῦμαι* occurs, Matt. xxvii. 12 *ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων*, 245 Acts xxii. 30 *τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται ὑπὸ (παρὰ) τῶν Ἰουδαίων* (2 Macc. ^{111 ed} x. 13). On the other hand, I can find no sufficient reason for taking *κεχάρισμαι* 2 Cor. ii. 10 passively, as Mey. does [yet in the 4th ed. he has it correctly].

In Rom. vi. 17 *ὑπακούσατε . . . εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς*, this construction is perhaps combined with an attraction (for *ὑπηκ. εἰς τύπον διδαχῆς*, ὃν παρεδόθητε, i.e. *παραδοθέντα ἔχετε*); yet see above, § 24, 2, p. 164.

Heb. vii. 11 *ὁ λαὸς ἐπ' αὐτῆς (ιερωσύνης) νενομοθέτηται* may probably be referred to *νομοθετεῖν τινι*: *the people have received the law* (founded) *on the priesthood*, cf. viii. 6. On the other hand, the passages quoted from the Sept. as parallel to *νομοθετεῖν τινά* (τι) do not belong here, as in that construction the verb always signifies: guide *some one* in accordance with law, e.g. Ps. cxviii. 33 *νομοθέτησόν με τὴν ὁδὸν τῶν δικαιομάτων σου*, xxiv. 8 *νομοθετήσῃ ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐν ἰδῶ*. But the Byzantine writers use *νομοθετεῖν τινι* (in reference to a country or people), Malal. p. 72, 194. The regular construction of the Passive occurs in Deut. xvii. 10 *ὅσα ἂν νομοθετηθῇ σοι*.

2. In the N. T. many verbs which in the Middle signification have uniformly in classical Greek the 1st Aor. Middle, take instead of that the 1st Aor. Passive (cf. § 38, 4), as: *ἀπεκρίθη*¹ (the prevailing form), especially in the Partic. *ἀποκριθεὶς* (Aor. Middle *ἀπεκρίνατο* Mark xiv. 61; Luke iii. 16; xxiii. 9; Jno. v. 19; xii. 23; Acts iii. 12, and frequently in var. as Jno. i. 26; xii. 34; xviii. 34),² cf. Sturz, dial. alex. p. 148 sq.; Lob. Phryn. 148 sq.; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 305. In like manner *διεκρίθη*, Matt. xxi. 21; Mark xi. 23; Rom. iv. 20 (but *ἐκρίθη* in a Passive sense in Acts xxvii. 1). In other passages Aorists still regarded as Aor. Pass. for ²³⁴ Middle, viz. *προσεκλήθη* Acts v. 36, *ἐνεδυναμώθη* Rom. iv. 20, *παρε-*^{614 ed} *δόθητε* vi. 17, *ταπεινώθητε* 1 Pet. v. 6; Jas. iv. 10, are really according to classic (and even N. T.) usage Passive Aorists; just as in Latin *servari*, *delectari*, are used for (taking German as the standard) *servare se*, *delectare se*, cf. Rost 568.³ The same remark 277

¹ Yet we find the form *ἀπεκρίθη* in the MSS. of Xen. A. 2, 1, 22. On Plato Alc. 2 p. 149 b. see Phryn. as above. In authors after the age of Alexander it occurs frequently.

² From which we find the Fut. *ἀποκριθήσομαι* Matt. xxv. 37, 45 and in the Sept.

³ The Aor. Mid. of such verbs is usually employed only with the Acc. in the reflexive construction mentioned § 38, 2. Thus *ἐσώθην* means *me servavi* (*servatus sum*): but one says *ἐσώσαμην τὸ σῶμα corpus meum* (*mihi*) *servavi*.

applies to the 2d Aor. *καταλλαγήτω* 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 20 (cf. Rom. v. 10), and to the Fut. (*προς*)*κολληθήσεται* Matt. xix. 5 (Eph. v. 31).

Eph. i. 11 *ἐκληρώθημεν* (see Harl. in loc.) and Acts xvii. 4 *προσεκληρώθησαν* are obviously to be taken Passively.

246 3. That the Perfect (Mtth. 1097) and the Plup. Passive have
7th ed. also a Middle signification is admitted on all hands since the old-fashioned Perf. and Plup. Middle disappeared from the grammars; Bttm. I. 362. In the N. T. compare Acts xiii. 2 (*εἰς*) *ὁ προσκέκλημαι αὐτοὺς whereunto I have called them for myself*, xvi. 10 *προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοὺς the Lord has called us for himself* etc. (cf. Exod. iii. 18; v. 3), xxv. 12 *καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι thou hast called for thyself upon Caesar* (appealed to him), Rom. iv. 21 *ὁ ἐπήγγελλται, δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι (ὁ θεός)*, Heb. xii. 26; Jno. ix. 22 *συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*, 1 Pet. iv. 3 *πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις* (1 Sam. xiv. 17; 2 Kings v. 25; Job xxx. 28; Zeph. iii. 15; Demosth. Nicostr. 723 c. etc.). (On the Perf. Passive of Deponents, see § 38, 7, p. 259.)

On the other hand, in 1 Pet. iv. 1 *πέπαιται ἀμαρτίας* (which is usually rendered *peccare desinit*, cf. Xen. C. 3, 1, 18) may be also taken as Passive: *he has rest from sin, is preserved from it*, see Kypke in loc. Phil. iii. 12, however, in no event comes under this head. *Πολιτεύομαι* (Acts xxiii. 1) may according to Poppo's theory be considered as a Deponent (since the Active in an intransitive sense is to be found); yet see above, p. 260. In Rom. xiv. 23 *κατακρίνεται* was undoubtedly employed by the apostle in a Passive sense.

The Perf. Passive is said to be used for the Perf. Active in Acts xx. 13 *οὕτω γὰρ ἦν (ὁ Παῦλος) διατεταγμένος*, and 2 Pet. i. 3 *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ... τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν δεδωρημένης* (cf. Jensii lectt. Lucian. p. 247). But in the first passage, *διατ.* is Middle (as in Polyaen. 6, 1, 5; Joseph. antt. 4, 2, 3 and elsewhere): *so had he appointed*; and in 2 Pet. i. 3 the Perf. comes from the Deponent ¹ *δωρέομαι*. Further, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 179 sqq.

235 Note 1. The Fut. Pass. is used in a very singular manner in Acts xxvi. 16
6th ed. *εἰς τοῦτα ὥφθη σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπέρτην καὶ μάρτυρα, ὡν τε εἶδες, ὡν*
278 *τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι*. Agreeably to the parallelism the passage might be trans-

¹ Markland (explicatt. vett. aliquot locor. in the Leipsic reprint of his edition of Eurip. suppl. p. 324 sq.) refers to this head also the passage, famous in the Predestination controversy, Acts xiii. 48, which he punctuates *κ. ἐπίστευσαν, ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι, εἰς ζωὴν αἰών.* and translates: *et fidem professi sunt, quotquot (tempus, diem) constituerant, in vitam aeternam.* This interpretation, however, should find with unprejudiced expositors as little approval as most of those which come from English philologists, (who at any rate give more attention to the N. T. than the German).

lated: *what thou hast seen, and what I will cause thee to see*, ὁφθήσομαι being taken in a causative sense (see Doederl. Soph. Oedip. C. p. 492; Bornem. in Rosenm. Rep. II. 289). The other interpretation, followed in general by Schott, Kühnöl, Heinrichs, Mey., de Wette: *de quibus* (in reference to which) or *quorum caussa tibi porro apparebo*, would on the whole be more suited to the context, and is certainly simpler than the former. As to ὦν for ἄ by attraction, see § 24, 2, p. 165 sq.

Note 2. As in the Hellenistic language many verbs which in classic Greek are neuter are used transitively (see above, p. 251), expositors affirm that the Passive also, conformably to this causal signification, is occasionally to be taken just like the Hebrew Hophal. But of this there is no certain or even probable instance. In Gal. iv. 9 γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ even the antithesis requires the passage to be rendered: *knowing God, or rather known* (recognized) *by God*, see my Comment. in loc. 1 Cor. viii. 3 εἰ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ should not be translated, as by Erasm., Beza, Nösselt, Pott, Heydenreich, et al.: *is veram intelligentiam consecutus est*; but the meaning is: *whoever imagines he knows anything* (that is where a γνώσις φυσιοῦσα exists) *has not yet known as one ought to know, but if any one loves God* (cf. the preceding words ἡ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ), *he* (has not only known as he ought to know, but) *is known by Him* (God), (is himself an object of the highest and truest, that is of divine, knowledge). In 1 Cor. xiii. 12 ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγινώσσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην, the latter undoubtedly refers to the knowledge of God, and Nösselt has correctly rendered the passage: *there we shall know all perfectly* (not ἐκ μέρους, not as if ἐν αἰνίγματι), *even as perfectly as God knows us*.¹ It has not yet been shown from Biblical Greek that γινώσκω denotes *cognoscere facere, edocere*; and probably Pott was not satisfied himself when he quoted Jno. v. 42; Rom. ii. 18. This meaning, however, meets us in a passage adduced by Stephanus in his Thesaurus from Demosth. cor. (p. 345 c.): ὁμολόγηκε νῦν γ' ἡμᾶς ὑπάρχειν ἐγνωσμένους ἐμὲ μὲν λέγειν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος, αὐτὸν δ' ὑπὲρ Φιλίππου; but it disappears if we read ἡμᾶς, as Dissen does, on the authority of a Cod., *nos esse cognitos* (i.e. de nobis constare), *me quidem verba facere pro patria*, etc.

Note 3. Frequently it has seemed doubtful whether a particular verbal form is Middle or Passive. The decision is grammatical only in so far as it can be shown that the verb in question was never used either in the Passive or in the Middle, or that in the Middle it had an Active signification. Hence in Rom. i. 24 ἀτιμίζεσθαι is properly regarded as Passive; so too οἰκοδομῆσθαι 1 Cor. viii. 10, παύεσθαι 1 Pet. iv. 1, ἀνανεοῦσθαι Eph. iv. 23. On the other hand, 1 Cor. i. 2 οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου can only be Middle. In other passages either the context must decide, — as in

¹ A similar antithesis of the Active and Passive occurs in Phil. iii. 12 f. Cf. Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 8 δύναται τις ὡφελῆσαι καὶ ἄλλους μὴ αὐτὸς ὡφελημένος; Liban. ep. 2.

2 Cor. ii. 10 where *κεχώρισμαι* (Mey. to the contrary [in his earlier edd.]) is to be regarded as Middle, and Rom. iii. 9 where *προέχεσθαι* clearly cannot be Passive; or the known usage of the writer elsewhere, as in Eph. vi. 10 in respect to *ἐνδυναμώσθε*.

§ 40. THE TENSES.

1. With regard to the Tenses of the verb, N. T. grammarians and expositors¹ have been guilty of the greatest mistakes.² In general, the tenses³ are employed in the N. T. exactly in the same manner as in Greek authors,⁴ viz. the Aorist marks simply the past (merely occurrence at some former time—viewed too as momentary), and is the tense usually employed in narration; the Imperfect and Pluperfect always have reference to secondary events connected in respect to time with the principal event (as relative tenses); the Perfect brings the past into connection with the present, representing an action in reference to the present as concluded. No one of these tenses strictly and properly taken can stand for another, as commentators often would have us believe.⁵ But where such an interchange appears to take place (cf. Georgi, Vind. p. 252 sqq. Hierocrit. I. 58 sq.) either it is merely apparent, and a sufficient reason (especially a rhetorical one) can be discovered why this and no other tense has been used, or it is to be set down to the account of a certain inaccuracy peculiar to the language of the people, which did not conceive and express relations of time with entire precision

¹ Cf. *Bertholdt*, Einleit. VI. 3151: "In the use of the tenses, it is well known that the N. T. writers pay very little regard to the rules of grammar."

² Occasioned in part by parallel passages which it was thought must be considered as exactly alike grammatically. The abuse of parallelism in exposition ought sometime to be exhibited separately.

³ The three principal tenses with the Greeks were the Present, the Perfect, and the Future: *Plut. Isid. c. 9 ἐγὼ εἶμι τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὃν καὶ ἐσόμενον*, cf. *Odyss. 16, 437*.

⁴ Cf., besides the well known grammatical works (especially *Hm. emend. rat. p. 180 sqq.*; *Schneider*, Vorles. über griech. Gramm. I. 239 ff.; *Krū. 147 ff.*), *L. G. Disson*, de temporibus et modis verbi graeci. Gött. 1808. 4to.; *H. Schmidt*, doctrinae tempor. verbi gr. et lat. expositio histor. Hal. 1836–1842. 4 Abthl. 4to. An earlier dissertation by *G. W. Oeder*, Chronol. grammat. Gött. 1743 (in *Pott*, Sylloge VII. 133 sqq.) is of little use. On the other hand, the enall. temp. was combated in *A. zum Felde*, de enall. praes. temp. in S. S. usu. Kil. 1711. 4to., and in *Waken's* work, mentioned above (p. 8, Note ¹); cf. also the views of *Aristides* in *Georgi*, Vind. 252.

⁵ The arbitrary interchange of tenses (enallage temporum) is accounted a Hebraism, as it is imagined that in Hebrew the Preterite is indiscriminately used for the Future, and vice versa. But the incorrectness of this opinion has been already shown by *Gesenius* (*Lehrgeb. S. 760 sqq.*), and still more thoroughly by *Ewald* (*Krit. Gr. 523 ff.*).

(Krü. 158 f.). The latter occurs chiefly in the interchange (or combination) of those tenses which, like the Preterites, denote one and the same principal relation of time.

2. Accordingly the PRESENT tense, which expresses present time ²⁴⁹ in all its relations (particularly in rules, maxims, and principles of ^{7th ed.} permanent validity, cf. Jno. vii. 52), is used

a. Only in appearance for the Future (exactly as in Latin, German, etc.) when an action still future is to be designated as as good as already present, either because it is already firmly resolved upon or because it follows according to some unalterable law ; as, Matt. xxvi. 2 οἰδατέ, ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται (*is the Passover*) καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι (*is delivered*, an event which as a divine decree is fixed), Jno. xiv. 3 ἐὰν πορευθῶ . . . πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι (xxi. 23), Matt. xvii. 11 Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται (a point of Jewish Christology) καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα cf. Jno. vii. 42, Luke xii. 54 ὅταν ἴδητε τὴν νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε· ὄμβρος ἔρχεται (in reference to a meteorological principle founded on experience), Col. iii. 6 δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας (according to a law of God's moral government), Heb. iv. 3 ; 1 Cor. iii. 13 ; xv. 2 ; Eph. v. 5. Hence the expression ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε, used by Jesus Jno. iv. 21 ; xvi. 2, and the Jewish designation ὁ ἐρχόμενος (κτῆ) for the Messiah. The phrase in John ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ followed by the Fut., Jno. xii. 23 ; xiv. 3 ; xvii. 24, may be also brought under this head, if we do not prefer the interpretation *where I am*, where I have my home. It would be a mistake in translating these passages to substitute the Future for the Present preferred by the writer. Cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 153 ; Krü. 149, and as to Latin, Ramshorn p. 401. In other passages the Present is employed to denote what is just about to take place, what one is on the point of doing, that for which he is already making preparation (Hm. Vig. 746 and Soph. 281 Oed. C. 91 ; Bekker, specim. Philostr. p. 73 sq. ; Schoem. ad Isaetm p. 202) ; as, Jno. x. 32 διὰ ποῶν αὐτῶν ἔργον λιθάζετέ με (they had already taken up stones), Jno. xiii. 6 κύριε, σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας ; (he had already prepared to wash them), xiii. 27 ; ¹ xvi. 17 ²³⁸ (ὑπάργω), xvii. 11 ; xxi. 3 ; 1 Cor. xii. 31 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 1 ; Rom. ^{6th ed.} xv. 25. See, in general, Held, Plutarch. Tim. p. 335 sq.

¹ Ὁ ποιεῖς, ποιήσον τάχιον quod (jam) facis, quo jam occupatus es, id (fac) perfice ocus ; cf. Arrian. Epict. 4, 9, 18 ποιεῖς ἃ ποιεῖς, 3, 23, 1, and Senec. benef. 2, 5 fac, si quid facis ; see Wetsten. I. 931. The command or recommendation here is not conveyed in the verb, but in the adverb annexed.

Many other passages have been referred to this head with still less plausibility. In Jno. iii. 36 the thought is weakened, if ἔχει be taken for ἔξει. The notion which John attached to ζωή not only admits, but almost requires, the Present. And apart from this, the expression ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον might very well be used of one who indeed is not yet in the enjoyment of eternal life, but who in the certainty of his hope already as it were possesses it.¹ So also Jno. v. 26; Matt. v. 46 have been correctly explained by Fr. On the other hand, we must not with him regard Matt. iii. 10 as a general maxim: *every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down* (is wont to be hewn down). These words are connected by οὖν with ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κείται, and require to be rendered with a special reference to the preceding δένδρα: *the axe is already lying at the root of the trees; accordingly every tree etc. is, (will be) to a certainty, hewn down*; i.e. from the fact of the axe's being already applied, it may be inferred what fate awaits the bad trees. 1 Cor. xv. 35 πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί treats of the resurrection of the dead, not as a fact (of the future), but as a doctrine: *in what manner does the resurrection of the dead* (according to thy teaching) *take place?* cf. vs. 42. In the same way we can say: Christ is the Judge; the punishments of the damned are eternal etc. In like manner Matt. ii. 4 τοῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γενᾶται (i.e. where is the birthplace of the Messiah?) and Jno. vii. 52. In 2 Cor. v. 1 οἶδαμεν, ὅτι, ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους καταλυθῇ, οἰκοδομῆν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομεν, the Future ἐξομεν would have been inexact; the instantaneous entrance into a new habitation, the moment the καταλύεσθαι takes place, is intended to be expressed. In Matt. vii. 8 the Present (of what usually occurs, Krü. 148) is connected, in a statement of universal application, with the Future, cf. Rom. vi. 16; Gal. ii. 16. On the other hand, in Matt. iii. 11 the Present and the Future (of one about to come) are intentionally distinguished: the Present refers to the predicted, permanent (and already present) personality; the Future, βαπτίσει, to a particular function which he is to execute. Lastly, in the parallel passages Matt. xxiv. 40 and Luke xvii. 34 we find in the former the Present, ὃ εἰς παραλαμβάνεται, but in the latter the Future, εἰς παραληφθήσεται; in the one passage the fact introduced by the Fut. (ἔσονται) is by a vivid conception regarded as present (see what follows); in the other, it is depicted in all its parts as future. Cf. besides, Jno. xvi. 14, 15; Heb. i. 11.

b. For the Aorist as a historical tense, only when the narrator wishes to represent the past vividly, as though it were just taking place (Longin. c. 25; Mith. 1135f.; cf. Zumpt, lat. Gramm. S. 431.);

Jno. i. 29 τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει ... καὶ λέγει (vs. 32 καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν), i. 44 εὕρισκει Φίλιππον καὶ λέγει (ἠθέλησεν just. before)

¹ In what immediately follows, οὐκ ὕψεται ζωὴν, the Apostle very accurately distinguishes the Future from the Present.

cf. 46, xiii. 4 f.; Matt. xxvi. 40 ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ εὐρίσκει ²³⁹
αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας. Such a Present is often introduced abruptly ^{6th ed.}
between Aorists, Jno. ix. 13; xviii. 28; xix. 9; Acts x. 11; Mark
v. 15; or Present and Aorist are combined in the same verse, as
Mark vi. 1; ix. 2; xi. 15; Jno. xx. 6, 19. In the first three Gospels
one Evangelist uses the Present, while in the corresponding nar-
rative another employs the Aorist; with Matt. xxi. 13 cf. Mark
xi. 17 f., and with Matt. xxii. 23 cf. Mark xii. 18. This Present
occurs also in the Apocalyptic visions; as, Rev. xi. 9; xii. 2. As ²⁵¹
to the Sept., in which this usage is extremely rare, see Thiersch ^{7th ed.}
p. 187. Suddenness in a series of past events is indicated with
striking effect by the Present in Matt. ii. 13 ἀναχωρησάντων αὐτῶν
ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ, etc.

Similar instances occur in Xen. Hell. 2, 1, 15; Cyr. 4, 6, 4; 10; 5, 4, 3;
Ages. 2, 19-20; Thuc. 1, 48; 2, 68; Paus. 1, 17, 4; 9, 6, 1; Arrian. Al.
7, 17, 5; Dion. H. IV. 2113; Achill. Tat. 4, 4, p. 85; Jacobs, Xen. Ephes.
5, 12, p. 113; cf. Abresch, Aristaen. p. 11 sq.; Ast, Plat. Phaedr. p. 335;
Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 68.

c. Sometimes the Present includes also a past tense (Mdv. 108),
viz. when the verb expresses a state which commenced at an earlier
period but still continues, — a state in its duration; as, Jno. xv. 27
ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστέ, viii. 58 πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμι (cf.
Jer. i. 5 πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ, ἐπίσταμαί σε, Ps. lxxxix. 2),
2 Pet. iii. 4; 1 Jno. iii. 8. To this head may be referred likewise
Acts xxv. 11 εἰ μὲν ἀδικῶ καὶ ἄξιον θανάτου πέπραχά τι (cf. Xen. C.
5, 2, 24); ἀδικῶ, however, denotes a quality existing in reference to ²⁸³
the judge, ἀδικός εἰμι, see Bhdy. 370; Mtth. 1137. In Jno. viii. 14
there is first an Aorist and then a Present: οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον...
ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε, πόθεν ἔρχομαι.

In 1 Jno. iii. 5 the sinlessness of Jesus is considered as still present to
faith (see Lücke); but in Acts xxvi. 31 οὐδὲν θανάτου ἄξιον ἢ δεσμῶν πράσσει
does not refer to Paul's past life, but to his conduct in general: *this man*
(so simple an enthusiast) *does nothing bad*; see Bengel in loc. (Kühnöl is
wrong); cf. Jno. vii. 51. Recent expositors have admitted that in Heb.
ii. 16 ἐπιλαμβ. is not to be taken as a past tense (Georgi, Vind. 25;
Palair. 479); likewise εἰσίασω in ix. 6 is a pure Pres. In 1 Cor. xi. 30
κοιμῶνται is properly translated by Bengel *obdormiunt* (later critics have
all either rendered it as a past tense, or taken no notice of it; yet even
in Byzantine writers κοιμᾶσθαι signifies only to *fall asleep, expire*, and not
to *be dead*). On παράγεται in 1 Jno. ii. 8 see Lücke. In Jno. v. 2 no
expositor of any judgment will admit the possibility even that ἐστὶ stands
for ἦν. On the other hand, the use of the Present does not necessarily

prove that the locality was still in the same condition when the author wrote; cf. Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 135 sqq.

The Present in *dependent* clauses may appear to stand for the Imperfect; as, Jno. ii. 9 οὐκ ᾔδει, πόθεν ἐστίν, iv. 1 ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς . . . 240 ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει, Mark v. 14 ἐξήλθον ἰδεῖν, τί ἐστι τὸ γεγονός, xii. 41; xv. 47; 7th ed. Jno. i. 40; v. 13, 15; vi. 5, 24, 64; Luke vii. 37; xix. 3; Acts iv. 13; ix. 26; x. 18; xii. 3; Heb. xi. 8, 13 — (the Preterite, found in most of these passages according to a greater or smaller number of Codd., is a manifest correction.) But the use of the Present in such cases is a pure Greek construction (see Vig. p. 214 sq.; cf. below § 41 b. 5), founded 252 properly in a mingling of the oratio recta and oratio obliqua (Porson, 7th ed. Eurip. Orest. p. 36 Lips.),¹ cf. Pol. 5, 26, 6; 8, 22, 2 and 4; Ael. 2, 13 ext.; Long. past. 1, 10 and 13. In these passages the Imperf. or the Aor. might have intimated that what was inquired about or heard was already past at the time when the inquiry or the hearing took place; cf. Jno. ix. 8 οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον, ὅτι τυφλὸς ἦν, Luke viii. 53; Matt. xxvii. 18; Acts iv. 13.

3. THE IMPERFECT, as in Greek prose authors (Bhdy. 372 f.; Krü. 149 ff.), is used

a. When a past action is to be designated in relation to another simultaneous action as then going on (Bremi, Demosth. p. 19); as, Jno. iv. 31 ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ ἡρώτων αὐτὸν (viii. 6, 8), vi. 21; Luke 284 xiv. 7 ἔλεγε . . . ἐπέχων, πῶς τὰς πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο *how they* (then) *were choosing out*, xxiv. 32 ἡ καρδιά ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, Acts viii. 36 ὡς ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ἦλθον ἐπὶ τι ὕδωρ, x. 17; xvi. 4; xxii. 11; Luke vi. 19; Jno. v. 16; xii. 6.

b. To denote a continuous or statedly repeated past action (Mth. 1117, 1133; Schoem. ad Plut. Agid. p. 137; Held, Plutarch. Aem. P. p. 267); as, Jno. iii. 22 ἐκεῖ διέτριβε μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐβάπτιζεν, Rom. xv. 22 ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν, 1 Cor. x. 4 ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματ. ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας (where ἔπιον denotes simply the past and completed action; but ἔπινον the continuation of it during the journey through the wilderness), xiii. 11 ὅτε ἡμην νήπιος, ὡς νήπιος ἐλάλουν, Acts xiii. 11 περιάγων ἐξήτει χειραγωγούς, Matt. xiii. 34 χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει (during his ministry), cf. Luke v. 15; vi. 23; viii. 41, 52; xvii. 28; xxiv. 14, 27; Matt. iii. 5; xxvii. 39; Mark i. 7, 31; Jno. v. 18; vii. 1; xi. 5; xiii. 22 f.; xii. 2; xxi. 18; Acts vi. 1, 7 (Thuc. 1, 29); ix. 20; xi. 20; xviii. 25; xxvi. 1, 11; xxviii. 6; Rev. i. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 10;

¹ On the still more extended use of the Present in parenthetical clauses for a Preterite, see Bum. Gr. § 124, Note 6, and ad Philoct. p. 129.

Col. iii. 7, etc. So Xen. A. 1, 2, 18; 4, 5, 18; 5, 4, 24; 6, 3, 3; Mem. 1, 1, 5; Apol. Socr. 14. Accordingly the Imperfect denotes a custom or habit; as, Mark xv. 6 *κατὰ ἐορτὴν ἀπέλυνεν αὐτοῖς ἓνα δέσμιον*, xiv. 12 (Demosth. Phil. 2. 27 b.); cf. Hm. Vig. 746.

c. To express an action commenced in time past but not completed¹ (Schaeff. Demosth. I. 337 and Plutarch. IV. 398; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 646; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 282; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 220; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 178); as, Luke i. 59 *ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ ... Ζαχαρίαν* (the mother objects, and he is called John), Matt. 241 iii. 14 *ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης διεκώλυνεν αὐτόν* cf. vs. 15, Acts vii. 26 *συνήλ-^{6th ed.} λασσεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην* (Moses) cf. vs. 27 (according to good 253 Codd. [Sin. too], see Fritzsche de crit. conformat. p. 31). Similar^{7th ed.} instances occur in Eurip. Iph. T. 360; Herc. f. 437; Her. 1, 68; Thuc. 2, 5; Demosth. Mid. 396 b.; Xenoph. A. 4, 5, 19; Mem. 1, 2, 29; Paus. 4, 9, 4; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 337, note. On the other hand, Heb. xi. 17. (*προσέφερεν*) does not come under this head; but Gal. i. 13 probably would, if *πορθεῖν* be rendered *destroy*; yet see my Com. in loc.

d. Sometimes also in narration apparently for the Aorist, when events are described at which the narrator was present; as, Luke x. 18 *ἐθεώρουν τὸν σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα*. The narrative thus becomes more graphic and animated than it 285 would be with the Aorist, which simply reports and confines within a single point of time; cf. also Acts xvi. 22 *ἐκέλευον ραβδίζειν* (cf. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 620) *they gave orders* (while I was present) etc. (Mtth. 1117). Accordingly this may be referred to No. 1. Cf. Hm. Soph. Oed. C. p. 76; Soph. Aj. p. 139; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 155; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 225; Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 84, 142; Mtth. 1138; Bhdy. 373. In no case is it necessary to take this tense for the Pluperfect; (yet see Poppo, as above; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 5; Krüger, Dion. H. p. 304). In Acts iv. 13 *ἐθαύμαζον ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτοὺς, ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν* must be closely taken together: *they marvelled and recognized* (roused by their very wonder to more attentive observation) *that*, etc. Kühnöl is wrong, following Raphel, annot. II. 37.

In many passages Codd. vary between the Imperfect and the Aorist, e.g. Mark vi. 12; xiv. 70 (see Fr. in loc.), Acts vii. 31; viii. 17, as in Greek authors also the forms of these two tenses are often interchanged (cf.

¹ Hm. Soph. Aj. 1106: in eo, quod quis voluit facere, nec tamen perfecit, quod aptius adhiberi tempus potest, quam quod ab ea ipsa ratione nomen habet, imperfectum? Cf. Mde. 112.

Boisson. Eunap. p. 431 and Philostr. her. p. 530), and sometimes differ very little in meaning (Schaeff. Plutarch. IV. 346; Siebelis, Pausan. IV. 290). It often depends on the writer whether he will regard the action as momentary or as continued, — as a point or a period in time, Kühner II. 74 (Matt. xxvi. 59 ἐξήτουν ψευδομαρτυρίαν ... καὶ οὐχ εὗρον, but Mark xiv. 55 καὶ οὐχ εὗρισκον, cf. Matt. xix. 13 with Mark x. 13); and thus, particularly in (later) Greek writers, the Imperfect of verbs of *saying, going, sending* is not unfrequently used where the Aorist appeared to be requisite, Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 570 sq.; Held, Plutarch. Tim. p. 484 sq.; cf. Mark ii. 27; iv. 10; v. 18; vii. 17; x. 17; Luke iii. 7; vii. 36; viii. 9, 41; x. 2; Acts iii. 3; ix. 21.

The Imperfect and the Aorist are connected with appropriate distinction in Luke viii. 23 κατέβη λαίλαψ ... καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκυδένεον, xv. 28; Mark vii. 35; xi. 18; Jas. ii. 22; Matt. xxi. 8 f.; Jno. vii. 14; xii. 13, 17; xx. 3; Acts xi. 6 f.; xxi. 3 (Jno. i. 5); Philem. 13, 14; 1 Cor. xi. 23 (in the same way the Imperfect and Perfect in 1 Cor. xiii. 11) cf. Thuc. 7, 20, 254 44; Xen. A. 3, 4, 31; 5, 4, 24; Plutarch. Agis 19; Arrian. Al. 2, 20, 3; ^{7th ed.} Reisig, Soph. Oed. C. p. 254 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 29; Ellendt, Arrian. 242 Al. II. 67 sq.

^{6th ed.} The Imperfect might appear to be put for the Present (yet see Mehl- 286 horn, Anacr. p. 235 sq.; cf. Fuhr, Dicaearch. p. 156 sq.) in Col. iii. 18 ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ὡς ἀνῆκεν, ἐν κυρίῳ, ut par est, and in Eph. v. 4 (μὴ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν) αἰσχροτύτης ἢ μωρολογίας ἢ εὐτραπείας, ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν (immediately before, καθὼς πρέπει) var. But it must be rendered: ut oportebat, ut par erat, *as it should have been* (already hitherto), see Mith. 1138; Bornem. Schol. p. 181; for every such exhortation, strictly speaking, involves the assumption that what is enjoined has not hitherto been observed² (Krü. 150). Cf. § 41 a. 2. On Eph. as above, see *ibid.* In Matt. xxvii. 54 ἦν refers to one now dead: *he was God's Son*.

4. The PERFECT is employed in strict accordance with its proper import, whenever the past is to be put into relation with the present; that is, when something past is intended to be represented as something just now (in the present) completed: (*I have com-*

¹ The following passage is particularly instructive: Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 25, 9 sqq. δ Κροῖσος μετεπέμπετο ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τοὺς ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ πρωτεύοντας ... μετεπέμψατο δὲ καὶ Σόλωνα, etc. Cf. also Plat. Parmen. 126 c. ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἐβαδίζομεν καὶ κατελάβομεν τὸν Ἀντιφῶντα etc., and from the LXX. Num. xxxiii. 38 f. ἀνέβη Ἀαρὼν καὶ ἀπέθανεν ... Ἀαρὼν ἦν τριῶν καὶ εἴκοσι καὶ ἐκατὸν ἐτῶν, ὅτε ἀπέθνησken.

² To take ἀνῆκεν, as *Huther* does, for a Perfect with the meaning of the Present, is as unnecessary as it is grammatically inadmissible. Should καθῆκεν, προσῆκεν also be regarded as Perfects? Must then the Perfect ἦκα, elsewhere rare, have established itself just in these forms even in Attic? Besides, no passage can be adduced in which these words necessarily have the meaning of a Present, — provided only a reader acquires the power of keeping the German mode of thought subordinate to the Greek.

manded, my command is at present one previously given).¹ Here the result of the action is usually, but not necessarily (Krü. 151), conceived of as permanent. The following instances are especially instructive: Luke xiii. 2 δοκείτε, ὅτι οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι οὗτοι ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας ... ἐγένοντο, ὅτι τοιαῦτα πεπόνθασιν *that these Galileans were sinners because they have suffered*, i.e. suffered not merely once or in time past (that would be the Aor.), but that they stand recorded among the historical examples of those who have been cut off by (a violent) death; iv. 6 ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται (ἡ ἐξουσία) i.e. I am in possession of it, after having received it, commissam habeo potestatem (the Aorist would denote *it was delivered to me*, which would leave it uncertain whether the possession of it still continued); v. 32 οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους 255
I am not here (on earth) in order to, etc. (in Matt. ix. 13 in narrative style: οὐκ ἦλθον *I came not*, was not sent), cf. vii. 20, 50; 243
 Rom. vii. 2 ἡ ὑπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ *is bound*
 (accordingly belongs to), Gal. ii. 7 πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *con-*
creditum mihi habeo, etc. (his apostolic functions continue, he is still in the exercise of them), likewise 1 Thess. ii. 4 καθὼς δεδοκι- 287
 μάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, 1 Cor. xi. 15 ἡ κόμη αὐτῇ περιβολαίου δέδοται (γυναικί) *she has* (by a fixed arrangement of nature) *hair for*, etc., Heb. x. 14 μὴ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους (where the contrast μὴ ... τετελείωκεν must not be overlooked), Jno. xix. 22 ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα, Mark x. 40; xi. 21; xvi. 4; Luke xiii. 12; Jno. vii. 19, 22; viii. 33; xiii. 12;² xv. 24; xix. 30; xx. 21; Acts viii. 14; Rom. iii. 21; v. 2; ix. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 11; iv. 4; vii. 14 f.; 2 Cor. iii. 10; vi. 11; Col. ii. 14; iii. 3; Heb. i. 4; iii. 3; vii. 6, 14; viii. 6, 13; ix. 18, 26; xii. 2; 1 Jno. v. 9 f.; 3 Jno. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 1; Rev. iii. 17. Hence in quotations from the O. T. prophecies the very frequent use of γέγραπται, or κεχρημάτισται Heb. viii. 5, or εἶρηκε Heb. i. 13; iv. 4, etc.³

¹ *Hm.* emend. rat. p. 186: γέγραφα tempus significat praeteritum terminatum praesenti tempore ita, ut res, quae perfecto exprimitur, nunc peracta dicatur, illudque jam, peractam rem esse, praesens sit. *Poppo* in his Progr. Emendanda et supplenda ad Matthiaei gram. gr. (Frkf. on the Oder, 1832) p. 6, thus defines the nature of the Perfect: actionem plane praeteritam, quae aut nunc ipsum seu modo finita est aut per effectus suos durat, notat.

² Γινώσκετε, τί πεποίηκα ὑμῖν; where the finished action (ἐνίψα) is represented, according to its symbolical import, as continuing its influence down to the present. Cf. xv. 18.

³ Likewise in 2 Cor. xii. 9 εἶρηκέ μοι· ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου the Perfect refers to a statement (of the Lord's) which was to be expressed as not merely having been made,

We find the Perfect and Aorist joined together (cf. Weber, Demosth. 480) in Luke iv. 18 *ἔχρισέ με εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ἀπέσταλκέ με κηρύξαι* *he anointed me . . . and hath sent me* (the former viewed as what took place once; the latter, as still present in its effects), Mark xv. 44 *Πιλάτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκε· καὶ . . . ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανε* (the latter referring to the event, the act of dying; the former, to the effect, the *being dead*), Heb. ii. 14 *ἐπεὶ τὰ παιδία κεκοινώνηκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, καὶ αὐτὸς μετέσχε* (at his incarnation) *τῶν αὐτῶν*, 1 Cor. xv. 4 *ὅτι ἐτάφη* (an event that once took place, long past) *καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* (continues in its effects in the new life of Jesus), 2 Cor. i. 19; ix. 2; Acts xxi. 28; Jno. viii. 40; iv. 38; xiii. 3; 1 Jno. i. 1.¹ Characteristic are the following passages also: Col. i. 16 *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα* (the act of creation) . . . *τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται* (doctrinal view of the completed and now existing creation), Jno. xvii. 14; xx. 23 (Mey); 1 Cor. xv. 27; Col. iii. 3.

The Perfect simply for the Aorist in narration occurs in Rev. v. 7 *ἦλθε καὶ εἴληφε* (*τὸ βιβλίον*) without var., viii. 5. The Perfect is thus used purely with the signification of an Aorist particularly in later writers (especially the Scholiasts, Poppo, Thuc. 256 III. II. 763), Schaef. Demosth. I. 468; Wytttenbach, Plut. Mor. I. 7th ed. 321 sq. (Lips.); Lehrs, quaestion. epic. p. 274; Index to Petr. 244 Patric. in the Bonn edition, p. 647; Bhdy. 379. Less remarkable 6th ed. is 2 Cor. xi. 25 . . . *ἔλαβον, ἐρράβδισθην . . . ἐλιθάσθην . . . ἐναυάγησα,* 288 *νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα*, Heb. xi. 28 *πίστει πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος* (nothing but Aorists precede and follow) cf. also verse 17. In such enumerations of detached facts, it was a matter of indifference whether the Aorist or the Perfect should be employed, they are both alike suitable (I was stoned, I suffered shipwreck, I have spent a day, etc.). In Mark iii. 26 nobody will take *μεμέρισται* after *ἀνέβη* for an Aorist because in vs. 25 the Aor. *μερισθῇ* occurs.

The Perfect is used for the Present,

a. Only in so far as the Perfect denotes an action or state whose commencement and occasion were completed in time past (Hm. Vig. 748); as, Jno. xx. 29 *ὅτι ἑώρακάς με, πεπίστευκας*, where the *origin* of his (still existing faith) is intended to be indicated, iii. 18;

but as still in force (*he has given me an answer, and I must rest satisfied with it*). I do not see what Rückert could here find strange. Meyer is now right.

¹ Cf. Lucian. dial. d. 19, 1 *ἀφάπισας αὐτὸν καὶ νενίκηκας*.

xi. 27; v. 45 *Μωϋσῆς, εἰς δὲ ἠλπίκατε*, in whom you have (placed your hope) hoped, and still hope (in quo repositam habetis spem vestram). Similar instances are, 2 Cor. i. 10 *εἰς δὲ ἠλπίκαμεν*, 1 Tim. vi. 17; Jude 6. As to *έώρακα* Jno. ix. 37, etc., see note further on. 2 Tim. iv. 8 *ἡγαπηκότες τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ who have loved*, and therefore now love. The Pluperf. of such verbs has naturally the signification of the Imperfect, Luke xvi. 20. To this head we must by no means refer Jno. i. 34 *κἀγὼ έώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα*, where the latter Perfect appears to denote that the testimony concerning Christ given by John at the baptism stands complete, continues firm and valid: *I have seen and have testified*. Essentially the same explanation applies to the Perfects in Heb. vii. 6 (9), where it is manifest that more than a mere fact is intended to be related.

b. After clauses which convey a supposition (*εἰ, εἰάν* with a Fut. or Aor., seldom with a Particip.) to express an action *still future*, but viewed in this event as (occurring forthwith and so) wholly completed;¹ as, Eurip. El. 686 *εἰ παλαισθεῖς πτόμα θανάσιμον πεσεῖ, τέθνηκα ἐγώ*, Soph. Philoct. 75 and Liv. 21, 43 *si eundem animum habueritis, vicimus*, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 156; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 470; Hm. Aristoph. nub. p. 175 sq.; Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 512 and Gr. 1125 f.; Krü. 152. In the N. T. see Rom. xiv. 23 *ὁ διακρινόμενος, ἐὰν φύγῃ, κατακέκριται is condemned*, the sentence of condemnation has been (at the same moment) and remains pronounced against him, he lies under condemnation, 257
iv. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 19, 20, and with a Participle Jno. 7th ed.
iii. 18 *ὁ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται*, Rom. xiii. 8. On the other 289
hand, the Perfect is not used for the Fut. in Jno. v. 24 *μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν*; the passage has no reference at all to a future event, but to something that has already occurred 245
(*ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον*), cf. 1 Jno. iii. 14; Lücke, Comment. II. 52. 6th ed.
Further, in Jno. xvii. 10 Christ uses the word *δεδόξασμαι* proleptically in reference to the disciples, who already believe, cf. xvi. 11; but in xiv. 7 *καὶ ἀπ' ἄρτι γινώσκετε αὐτὸν καὶ έώρακατε αὐτόν* must be rendered: *from henceforth ye know him and have seen him*, not with Kühnöl: *eum mox accuratius cognoscetis et quasi oculis videbitis*, cf. Demosth. Lacrit. 597 a. *ἀνθρώπῳ, δὲ ἡμεῖς οὔτε γινώσκομεν οὔθ' έώρακαμεν πώποτε*. See, further, Lücke in loc.

¹ The N. T. does not contain a clear instance of the Hebrew prophetic Perfect (*Gesen. Lg. 764*), which in the Sept. is usually rendered by a Future. Akin to it is the usage of the Greek *argurs*, who begin with the Fut. but continue in the Aorist, Iliad. 4, 158 sqq.; Pind. Pyth. 4, 56; Isthm. 5, 51, see *Böckh* not. crit. p. 462.

In Jas. v. 2 ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν σέσηπε, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν σιγήσῃ, γέγονεν the Perf. is not put for the Prés. or Fut.; but the case indicated by the Apostle in ταλαιπωρ. ὑμῶν τ. ἐπερχομ. is viewed as already present, and consequently the σήπειν of the riches as already completed. In Jno. xvii. 22 δέδωκα does not signify *tribuiam*; Christ contemplates his life as terminated, his disciples have already assumed his place. In Luke x. 11 δέδωκα and δίδωμι would be equally appropriate; Tdf. justly prefers the former.

That the Perf. is used also for the Pluperf. (which is not impossible), Haab p. 95 erroneously attempts to prove by Jno. xii. 7 εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ τετήρηκεν αὐτό; for here τετήρηκεν is to be regarded as strictly a Perfect (*she has kept it*, and accordingly uses it now), since Jesus means figuratively to represent *this* anointing as that which prepares him for the grave. The reading, however, is doubtful.

That the Perfects (and Aorists) of many verbs have inherently, and according to established usage, the signification of the Present, is well known; and is explained by the (inchoative) primary meaning of these verbs (Fr. Rom. I. 254; Bengel on Rom. iii. 23); as, κέκτημαι *I possess*,¹ 290 from κτάομαι *I acquire*; κεκοίμημαι (*I have fallen asleep*) *I am asleep*, from κοιμάομαι *fall asleep*; οἶδα *I know*, from εἶδω *I see*; ἵστηκα *I stand*, from ἵστημι *place*, properly, *I have placed myself* (hence also 2 Thess. ii. 2 ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Χρ. cf. Palair. in loc., Rom. ix. 19 τίς ἀνθέστηκε *who resists him?* cf. xiii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 6 ἐφέστηκε); likewise ζῶκα Jas. i. 6, 23. The Plup. of such verbs then naturally becomes equivalent to an Imperfect,

258 as εἰστήκεισαν Matt. xii. 46, ᾗδεν Jno. ii. 9; xx. 9, etc. Also κέρραγα from 1th ed. κράζειν has the meaning of a Present (Jno. i. 15), see Bttm. II. 57; Bhdv. 279, and ἑώρακα sometimes signifies: *I (have got a sight, and) see* Jno. ix. 37; 1 Jno. iv. 20. But in Phil. iii. 7 ἡγήμαι (Mtth. 1139) is to be taken as properly a Preterite antithetical to ἡγούμαι verse 8.

246 On the other hand the Present ἤκω means, *I have come, I am here* (Mtth. 1136) Jno. ii. 4; iv. 47; 1 Jno. v. 20, and so ἀκούω may be sometimes rendered by *audisse* 1 Cor. xi. 18 (Xen. A. 5, 5, 8; Mem. 3, 5, 9; Plat. Gorg. 503 c.; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 8; see Lucian. fug. 7; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 9 sq.; Franke, Demosth. p. 62). This, however, is the case only when the hearing (in effect) continues; as we too say: *I hear* thou art sick, cf. 2 Thess. iii. 11 and Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 246.² To denote the act of hear-

¹ In the N. T. this verb, in other tenses besides the Perfect, is occasionally translated incorrectly by *possess*. Luke xviii. 12 should be rendered, of all *I acquire*, quae mihi redeunt; and xxi. 19 by perseverance *acquire*, or you *will acquire*, your souls; they will then for the first time become your true property, not to be taken away. Schott now explains the passage rightly. As to 1 Thess. iv. 4, see de Wette. Yet κτάομαι appears to signify *possideo* in Aesop. 142, 2. As to κοιμῶνται 1 Cor. xi. 30, which also is usually considered as equivalent to *κεκοιμήνται*, see above, 2 c. p. 267.

² Just so *τινὸς ἀνομιᾶς* *I understand*, Demosth. Calipp. p. 719 c. etc.

ing completed in time past, a Greek must say ἀκήκοα. Ἀπέχω, in the same way, may be translated by *accepisse*, Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16; Phil. iv. 18, it is properly, however, like *weghaben* in German (have already, or in full, received), Wytttenbach, Plutarch. Mor. II. 124; Palair. p. 25.

5. The AORIST (E. A. Fritsch, *de aoristi vi ac potest.* Frcf. 1837. 4to.; H. Schmidt, *der griech. Aorist in s. Verhältnissen zu d. übrigen Zeitformen.* Halle, 1845. 8vo.) is used,

a. In narration for the Pluperfect (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 157; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 98 and Lucian. Alex. p. 106; Kühner, Gr. II. 79):

α. in subordinate clauses specifying time; as, Acts v. 24 ὡς ἤκουσαν τ. λόγους . . . διηπόρουν, Luke vii. 1 ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν τὰ ῥήματα . . . εἰσῆλθεν (ii. 39; xxii. 66; Jno. vi. 16; ix. 18; xiii. 12; xxi. 9; Acts xxi. 26), cf. Thuc. 1, 102 οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι . . . ἐπειδὴ ἀνεχώρησαν . . . ξύμμαχοι ἐγένοντο, Aesch. ep. 1. p. 121 c.; Mdv. 113 f.

β. in relative clauses; as, Acts i. 2 ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις οὗς ἐξελέξατο, ix. 35 [Matt. ii. 9 ὃν εἶδον, xxvii. 55 αἰτίνας ἠκούθησαν] Jno. xi. 30; iv. 45, 46; Luke xix. 15; xxiv. 1; Mdv. 114. Thus probably are the Aorists to be rendered also in a clause with ὅτι, Jno. vi. 22; see the expositors. The reason of this usage is, that the Greeks (who in such cases seldom or never employ the Pluperfect, Bhdy. 380) viewed the occurrence merely as past, not in relation to another occurrence also past. The Aor. is thus used in independent clauses, when they contain supplementary remarks, 291 Matt. xiv. 3 f. Whether this also applies to Jno. xviii. 24, cannot be decided on grammatical grounds. In Matt. xxvi. 48 ἔδωκεν is probably not to be rendered as a Pluperf. (Fr.), see BCrus. and Mey. On the contrary, the Pluperf. is regularly employed in such clauses even in the N. T.: Jno. xi. 19, 57; viii. 20; Acts ix. 21; Mark xiv. 44; Matt. vii. 25.

With very great want of judgment Haab S. 95 (cf. also Pasor S. 235) refers to this head a number of other passages, in which either the Aor. 259 retains its original import, or is owing to a somewhat different account of one Evangelist which must not be arbitrarily harmonized with the others' narrative; as, Jno. xviii. 12 συνέλαβον τὸν Ἰησοῦν. According to the other Evangelists (Matt. xxvi. 50 f.; Mark xiv. 46) the seizing and binding preceded Peter's striking with his sword. John, however, may wish to imply that Peter interposed with his sword at the moment when the guard were laying hands on Jesus. On Matt. xxvii. 37 καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην de Wette very appropriately remarks: "This, as respects the matter of fact, is to be considered as a 247 Plup. — (though we must admit it to be possible that the narrator of this, 6th ed.

not himself an eye-witness, may have supposed that the affixing of the superscription did not take place until this time), but according to the language it is a simple preterite. *The narrator here does not observe the order of time.* That the Evangelist does not exactly follow the order of time is obvious besides from this, that after he has made the soldiers sit down to watch Jesus, he proceeds vs. 38 to introduce the crucifixion of the two robbers: τότε σταυροῦνται, κ.τ.λ. Should this also be regarded as Plup.? In Mark iii. 16 ἐπέθηκε τῷ Σίμωνι ὄνομα Πέτρον is not to be translated by *imposuerat*; for Mark had not yet recorded the circumstance and it must not be thus as a matter of course supplied from John (i. 43). Also in Acts vii. 5 ἔδωκεν is not to be taken as a Plup.; this is manifest from the antithesis: *he gave not ... but promised.* It seems equally unnecessary to take the Aor. as Plup. in Acts iv. 4; viii. 2; xx. 12.¹ As to Mark xvi. 1 compared with Luke xxiii. 56, see Fr.

That the Aorist stands for the Perfect cannot be shown with certainty from any passage. Luke i. 1 ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ... ἔδοξε κάμει must be taken in the narrative style: *as many undertook ... I too did* terminated, etc. So also ii. 48 τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ... ἐξητοῦμέν σε. More plausible instances are the following: xiv. 18 ἀγρόν ἡγόρασα, 19 ζεύγη βοῶν ἡγόρασα etc., Phil. iii. 12 οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη λαβὼν ἤδη τετελείωμαι, Jno. xvii. ἐγὼ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα, etc. But in all these the action is exhibited merely as come to pass, as occupying a single point of time past, simply as gone by, (in Luke, as above, in contrast with a present action) *I bought* a field, a yoke of oxen, etc. In Phil. as above in particular λαβὼν seems to denote merely the attaining of the goal as an honorable achievement, while τετελ. denotes its consequences. Likewise in Rom. xiv. 9; Rev. ii. 8 the Aorists are simply narrative, and in reference to the death of Christ the Perfect could not even be used here. In Mark xi. 1 the Perf. is now in the text; but the Aorist also would be appropriate, see Fr. As to Greek usage, cf. Böckh, Pind. III. 185; Schaef. Eurip. Phoe. p. 15; Mtth. 1118. It often depends on the writer which of the two tenses he will use, as the difference between them is sometimes very slight, cf. Xen. Mem. 1, 6, 14; Dion. II. IV. 2320; Alciph. 3, 46. (The Codd. occasionally vary — as well those of the Greek authors, see e. g. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 434, 566, as those of the N. T. — between the Aorist and the Perfect, e. g. Jno. vi. 32; 1 Cor. ix. 15).²

¹ Markland (explicatt. vett. aliq. loc. in the Leipzig reprint of his edition of Eurip. Suppl. p. 326) erroneously refers to this head Matt. xxviii. 17 οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν also on which see Valcken. annot. crit. p. 350.

² If in Matt. xxi. 20 πῶς be taken as an exclamation (*quam*), ἐξήρανται might have been expected instead of ἐξηράνθη, as in Mark xi. 21 according to good Codd. But the latter passage is not entirely parallel, and Matt. xxi. 20 is probably to be rendered *how did the fig-tree wither suddenly?* They desire an explanation of what (according to this Evangelist's narrative) had taken place before their eyes. The disciples therefore allude to the fact of ἐξηραυν., and not to the consequences.

b. It is only in appearance that the Aorist is used for the Future 248
(Hm. Vig. p. 747. cf. above 4. b.),¹ e.g. Jno. xv. 6 *ἐὰν μή τις μείνη* 6th ed.
ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλήμα in such case (should that have
happened) *he (was) is cast away*, not *he will be cast away* (the not
abiding has this as its instantaneous consequence: whoever has
severed himself from Christ, resembles a branch broken off and
thrown away. With this *βληθῆναι* the Presents *συνάγουσιν* etc. are
connected). Cf. as to this passage Hm. de emend. p. 192 sq. and
Vig. as above. Rev. x. 7 *ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθῃ τὸ*
μυστήριον, in the mouth of the angel describing the future: *then is*
finished the mystery, 1 Cor. vii. 28. Cf. Eurip. Med. 78 *ἀπωλό-*
μεσθ' ἄρ', εἰ κακὸν προσοίσομεν νέον παλαιῷ, Plat. Gorg. 484 a.
The Aor. never occurs in this sense without an antecedent clause.
In Jno. xvii. 18 *ἀπέστειλα* is *I sent them forth* (which took place
when the apostles were chosen). In xiii. 31 Jesus says: *νῦν ἐδοξά-*
σθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the traitor Judas having gone away and as
it were already completed his treason. In Mark iii. 21 *ἐξέστη* has
the force of the Present *insanit*, cf. vs. 22. Jude 14 is a verbatim
quotation from the (Greek) book of Enoch, and the Aor. represents
the coming of Christ as having already taken place. In Rom.
viii. 30 *ἐδόξασε* is used, because he in reference to whom God has
completed the *δικαιοῦν* has also already obtained from God the 293
δοξάζεσθαι, (though the *δόξα* as an actual possession will not be
imparted to him until later).

1. Nowhere in the N. T. does the Aorist express what *is wont* to be
done (Schæf. Demosth. I. 247; Wex, Antig. I. 326; Mdv. 110). In Luke
i. 51 God's *μεγαλεῖα* (vs. 49) are spoken of as already accomplished, only
the respective parallel members must not be taken too rigidly in a historical
sense. In Jno. viii. 29 *οὐκ ἀφήκέ με μόνον ὁ πατήρ* means *the Father left*
me not alone (on the earth), that is, he granted me, besides having sent me
(*πέμψας*), also (hitherto) his unceasing aid. In 1 Jno. ii. 27 it is equally
unnecessary to take *ἐδίδασκεν* as denoting *wont to teach*; Lücke in his 2d
ed. has correctly explained the passage. As to Rom. viii. 30 see above.
Heb. x. 5, 6 is a verbatim quotation from Ps. xl. applied to the fact of 261
Christ's *εἰσερχ. εἰς τὸν κόσμον*. Heb. i. 9 (Sept.) *ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην* etc. 7th ed.
contains the reason for the annexed *διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρυσέ σε ὁ θεός*, and the
former is as strict an Aorist as the latter. Sooner might Jas. i. 11
ἀνέτελεν ὁ ἥλιος σὺν τῷ καύσωνι καὶ ἐξήρανε τὸν χόρτον etc. be referred
to this head (cf. 1 Pet. i. 24), as has already been done by Piscator; but

¹ In 1 Cor. xv. 49 *ἐφορέσαμεν* might seem to stand for the Fut. Perf.; but Paul places
himself in the point of view of the Parousia, and speaks in the narrative style of the life
passed on earth.

the Aorists are narrative (representing the fact as having taken place), and taken together indicate the rapid succession of the events: *the sun rose, and (immediately) withered* etc. (Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 53), — scarcely was the sun risen, when it withered. Moreover, passages such as Eph. v. 29 form the transition to this use of the Aorist, which can be easily traced to the primary import of the tense (Hm. de emend. rat. 249 187). In Jas. i. 24 *κατενόησεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθε καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο* 6th ed. *ὁποῖος ἦν* neither the Aorist nor the Perfect is put for the Present, but the case supposed for illustration in vs. 23 is assumed as matter of fact, and the Apostle falls into the strain of narration.

2. Quite unnecessarily Pott maintains that in 1 Cor. ix. 20 *ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος* the Aor. is used for the Present. The Apostle states how he has hitherto acted. Heumann on 1 Cor. iv. 18, and many expositors on Jas. ii. 6 *ἡγιάσατε* (which even Gebser renders by the Present), have made the same mistake. Tholuck's present view of Jno. xv. 8 *ἔδοξάσθη* is more correct than his former opinion; the Aorist is proleptic, as in Eph. ii. 6; Rom. viii. 30. In Matt. iii. 17 (xii. 18; xvii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 17) Sept. the Aorist *εὐδόκησα* may be taken naturally: my good pleasure fixed upon him, I took him into favor; see Mey. Hm. Vig. 746, No. 209, treats merely of poetic usage, and his remarks have with great discrimination been rendered still more clear and precise by Moller in the Zeitschrift f. Alterth.-Wiss. 1846, No. 134–136.

In epistles *ἔγραψα*, as is well known, is used for *γράφω*, like *scripsi* in Latin, in reference to the epistle which is just being written. In the same way *ἐπεμψα* *misi* is used, out of regard for the fact that to the receiver of 204 the epistle the *πέμπω* has become an *ἐπεμψα*. As to the latter, compare in the N. T. Acts xxiii. 30; Phil. ii. 28, *ἀνέπεμψα* Philem. 11, probably also *συνεπέμψαμεν* 2 Cor. viii. 18 (Demosth. ep. 3; Alciph. 3, 30 and 41); as similar, *ἡβουλήθην* 2 Jno. 12. On the other hand, not even *ἔγραψα* in 1 Cor. v. 11 can be quoted as an instance of that use. This Aorist, rather, refers in all cases either to a previous epistle (1 Cor. v. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 3, 4, 9; vii. 12; 3 Jno. 9), or to an epistle already brought to its conclusion (Rom. xv. 15; Philem. 19; Gal. vi. 11; 1 Pet. v. 12), or even to a series of verses just finished (1 Cor. ix. 15; 1 Jno. ii. 21, 26; v. 13). For an epistle in course of being written *γράφω* is more usual, 1 Jno. ii. 12, 13; 1 Cor. iv. 14; xiv. 37; 2 Cor. xiii. 10, etc. As to 1 Jno. ii. 13 f. see Lücke. In the Greek writers also this use of the Aor. (or Perf.) for the Pres. is not carefully observed; cf. Diog. L. 7, 9. See Wyffenbach, Plut. Moral. I. 231 sq. Lips.

262 3. Lastly, the Aor. is not employed *de conatu*¹ (Kühnöl) in Mark ix. 17 7th ed. *ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου*. These words denote: *I brought my son* to thee (and I present him now to thee). That *ἐξήλθε* Jno. xi. 44 need not be thus

¹ Schaefer. Plut. IV. 398 declares himself against Hm. Soph. Aj. 1105. Yet cf. Hm. Iphig. Taur. p. 109.

explained, has been perceived by Kühnöl himself; and Tholuck very properly takes no notice of such an interpretation. On Matt. xxv. 1 see Mey.

6. The FUTURE¹ does not always denote pure and actual futurity, but sometimes what is possible (as futurity and possibility are 250 closely related) and in fact what *may* or *should* take place (ethical possibility), Hm. Vig. p. 747; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 134; Krü. 156. This is particularly the case in questions. Owing, however, to the great resemblance between the Future and the Aor. Subjunctive and the variations in MSS., the passages in question are not all established. Luke xxii. 49 κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ *are we to smite*, etc.? (strictly, *shall* we—with thy permission—smite, wilt thou allow us to smite? cf. Eurip. Io 771 εἰπωμεν ἢ συγῶμεν; ἢ τὶ δράσομεν;), Rom. x. 14 πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται, εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; *how can they call*, etc.? iii. 6 ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον; Jno. vi. 68; Matt. xii. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 5; 1 Cor. xiv. 16 (Plat. Lys. 213 c. τί οὖν δὴ χρῆσόμεθα, Lucian. Tox. 47 πῶς οὖν . . . χρῆσόμεθα τοῖς παροῦσι). On the other hand, in Matt. vii. 24 ὁμοιώσω retains the simple force of the Fut., as does τολμήσω in Rom. xv. 18. In Rom. v. 7 something is expressed which is never likely to take place. 1 Cor. viii. 8 is similar. In Rom. vi. 1 and 15 the Subjunctive is 295 the preferable reading, as also in Luke iii. 10; Jno. vi. 5; but in Ront. vi. 2 the authority for ζήσομεν predominates, and the Future here forms a distinct contrast to the Aor. ἀπεθάνομεν. Mark iv. 13 and 1 Cor. xiv. 7 are strict Futures. In Matt. vii. 16 ἐπιγινώσθε does not contain a precept (ye *shall*), but a simple reference to what time itself will show: by their fruits ye *will* know them (as ye observe them, in the course of your observations). In Rom. vi. 14 the Fut. expresses an assurance and is essentially connected with the Apostle's reasoning. 1 Cor. xv. 29 ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν is probably to be rendered: *else* (if Christ is not risen) *what will they do* (what are they about to do, what do they purpose) *who get themselves baptized over the dead* (are therefore in such case deluded)? The Pres. ποιῶσιν is manifestly a correction. The phrase τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν always means *quid dicemus*? not *quid dicamus*. 1 Cor. xiv. 15 προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ νοῦ expresses not a resolution (προσεύξομαι is 263 probably only a correction), but a Christian maxim which the be-^{th ed.}

¹ The 3d Fut. Pass. κερράξομαι occurring once (Luke xix. 40) in not a few Codd. stands for the 1st Fut., which in this verb is not in use, and has not the meaning which this form has in other cases (Mtth. 1118 f.; Mdv. 114; Janson, de graeci serm. paulo post futuro. Rastenburg, 1844. 4to.).

liever intends to follow, and is more decided than the Subjunctive. In 2 Cor. iii. 8 ἔσται refers to future δόξα. (As to such phrases as θέλεις ἐτοιμάσσωμεν and τί αἰρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω, where the Subjunctive also would be suitable, see § 41 a. 4, p. 285 and b. 4, p. 299.)

In the phrase ἐρεῖ τις dicat aliquis 1 Cor. xv. 35 ; Jas. ii. 18, the Fut. denotes a merely supposable case. But the Greek idiom is here more precise than the Latin : *some one will say*, I foresee it, I expect nothing else. So ἐρεῖς οὖν dices igitur Rom. ix. 19 ; xi. 19 Heb. xi. 32 ἐπιλείψει με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος is decidedly to be taken as a Future : time (I foresee) *will* fail me (*deficiet* me tempus). Philostr. her. p. 686 ἐπιλείψει με ἡ φωνή, cf. also longum est nare rare for the German-Latin idiom longum esset etc.).¹ Also in Luke 251 ed. xi. 5 τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔξει φίλον καὶ πορεύεται πρὸς αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου the Fut. is appropriately used ; take away the interrogative form and the ordinary Future remains : none of you will go to his friend at midnight, such importunity will never take place. Lastly in Matt. v. 39, 41 ; xxiii. 12 the notion of possibility is connected rather with ὅστις than with the Fut. ; and in Jas. ii. 10 the best Codd. [Sin. also] have the Subjunctive. (It would be altogether incongruous to take the Future as indicating nothing more than a wish in Rom. xvi. 20 ; Phil. iii. 15 ; iv. 7, 9, 19 ; Matt. xvi. 22.)

On the use of the Fut. for the Imperative, see § 43, 5, p. 315.

296 Some interpreters have preposterously asserted that the Fut. is used for the Preterite in Rev. iv. 9 ὅταν δώσουσι τὰ ζωὰ δόξαν . . . τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου . . . πεσοῦνται οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι, etc. ; but the passage must be rendered : *when* (as often as) *the beasts shall give glory . . . shall fall down*. On the other hand, the Fut., in expressing general truths, sometimes very nearly assumes the import of the Present ; as, Gal. ii. 16 ἐξ ἔργων νόμον οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ, Rom. iii. 20 : this is a rule which (since the introduction of Christianity) *will hold true* in the world. Substantially so also in Rom. iii. 30 ἐπεὶ περ εἰς ὁ θεός, ὃς δικαιοῦσιν περιτομῇ ἐκ πίστεως etc., where δικαιοῦν is regarded as an act of God which in the Christian method of salvation will be constantly thus realized. In Luke i. 37 ἀδυνατήσῃ is used, in an allusion to the O. T., of that which belongs to no particular time, but will always hold true (Theocr. 27, 9 ; see Hm. emend. rat. p. 197), cf. Rom. vii. 3. But in Matt. iv. 4 ζήσεται after Deut. viii. 3 denotes rather a rule established by God : *shall live*.

Note 1. The connection of different tenses by καί (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 274 sq. ; Reisig, Oed. Col. 419 ; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 700 ; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 59 a.), which has already been illustrated incidentally in the

¹ The case is different when the thought is expressed in the Optative with ἔν, as in Dion. H. 10, 2086 ἐπιλείποι ἂν με ὁ τῆς ἡμέρας χρόνος.

above examples, is partly to be accounted for by the fact that when an author is writing without rigorous exactness any one of several tenses may be employed without difference in the sense; and is partly intentional (Heb. ii. 14; 1 Cor. x. 4; xv. 4; Jas. i. 24; Jno. iii. 16; Phil. iii. 7 sq.; 1 Pet. iv. 6, etc.). The former, perhaps, is the case in Rev., as iii. 3; vi. 10; xii. 4; xvi. 21, etc. In none of these passages are the tenses used incorrect; and should any one discover something altogether extraordinary in such combinations (as e.g. Eichhorn, Einl. ins N. T. II. 378), he would only betray his defective knowledge of the Greek language. See my exeget. Studien I. 147 f.

Note 2. The tenses are used in the significations above elucidated for the most part only in the Indicative (and Participle) (Hm. emend. p. 189). In the other moods, particularly the Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative, the Aorist rarely denotes past time (1 Pet. iv. 6?), but generally retains, in distinction from the Present, only the notion of transientness or instantaneousness (cf. Pres. and Aor. Jno. iii. 16) Hm. Vig. 748, without reference to any definite time, Rost 587; Mdv. 109.

§ 41. THE INDICATIVE, SUBJUNCTIVE, AND OPTATIVE MOODS.¹ 252

1. According to Hermann, these moods are distinguished from each other as follows: The Indicative denotes what is *actual*, the Subjunctive and Optative what is *possible* merely: — the Subjunctive, what is *objectively* possible (the realization of which depends on circumstances);² the Optative, what is *subjectively* possible (simply conceived of, as e.g. a wish),³ Hm. emend. rat. I. 205 sqq.; ad Vig. 901 sq., more fully de particula *äv* p. 76 sq.;⁴ cf. also Schneider, Vorles. I. 230 ff.⁵ With Klotz, ad Devar., we have adhered to

¹ Cf. K. H. A. Lipsius, comm. de modorum usu in N. T. P. I. Lips. 1827. 8vo.

² "In conjunctivo sumitur res experientia comprobanda . . . ; conjunctivus est debere quid fieri intelligentis ac propterea expectantis quid eveniat" Hm. partic. *äv* p. 77.

³ Klotz, Devar. II. 104: Optativus modus per se non tam optationis vim in se continet, quam cogitationis omnino, unde proficiscitur etiam omnis optatio. Hm. partic. *äv* p. 77: Optativus est cogitantis quid fieri, neque an fiat neque an possit fieri quaerentis.

⁴ P. 77: Apertum est, in indicativo veritatem facti ut exploratam respici, in conjunctivo rem sumi experientia comprobandam, in optativo veritatis rationem haberi nullam, sed cogitationem tantummodo indicari. How Kühner combines this distinction between the Subjunctive and Optative with an original *temporal* import of both cannot be here explained in detail (Griech. Gr. II. 87 f.).

⁵ In the following works views quite different from this are maintained: W. Scheuerlein, über den Charakter des Modus in der gr. Sprache. Halle 1842. 4to. (n Program). W. Baumlein, über die gr. Modi und die Partikeln *κεν* u. *äv*. Heilbronn 1846. 8vo. (see Jahrb. Jahrb. Bd. 47. S. 353 f. and Zeitschr. f. Alterthumswiss. 1848. 104–106; 1849. 30–33). Aken, Grundzüge der Lehre von Tempus u. Modus im Griech. Güstrow 1850.

265 this theory, as nothing *in all respects* better seems yet to have been
7th ed. propounded; — least of all by Madvig.

In the N. T. these moods in their main distinctions, are employed with strict propriety (Hwiid to the contrary; — whom Kühnöl ad Acta p. 777 quotes with approval). Only it is noticeable that the Optative, as in the later Greek authors who do not aim at classic refinement, is partially set aside (more still than in Josephus), and in certain constructions is superseded by the Subjunctive.¹

298

a. IN INDEPENDENT PROPOSITIONS.

2. The use of the INDICATIVE in independent propositions is very
253 simple even in classic Greek. In reference to the N. T., accordingly,
6th ed. we have on this head but two remarks to make:

a. The Imperfect Indicative is sometimes employed, as in Latin (Zumpt, S. 446'), where we should use the Subjunctive; as, 2 Cor. xii. 11 ἐγὼ ὧφειλον ὑφ' ὑμῶν συνίστασθαι *debebam commendari I ought to have been commended*, Matt. xxv. 27 ἔδει σε βαλεῖν *thou oughtest to have put* etc. (2 Cor. ii. 3; Acts xxiv. 19; xxvii. 21), Matt. xxvi. 9 ἡδύνατο τοῦτο πραθῆναι etc., xxvi. 24 καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη *it were good for him (would have been)*, satius erat, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπέγνωκέναί τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης (Aristoph. nub. 1215; Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 40; Philostr. Apoll. 7, 30; Lucian. dial. mort. 27, 9; Diog. L. 1, 64), Acts xxii. 22 οὐ γὰρ καθῆκεν αὐτὸν ζῆν *he should not have lived* (i.e. he ought to have been put to death long ago), non debebat or debuerat vivere, cf. Mtth. 1138 f.; Stallb. Plat. Symp. p. 74. The Greeks and Latins here merely state what, independently of circumstances, *was proper*, what *should* or *should not* have taken place; and the reader, by combining this statement with the actual fact, infers the disapproval of the latter. The Germans (and English) start from the present state of the matter, and by the Subjunctive express disapproval of its origin. Both moods therefore are correct in thought. It must not, however, be supposed that in such Greek constructions there is an omission of *ἄν*; for such expressions to the mind of a Greek exclude all thought of a condition under which something would have been good or must have happened; see Hm. partic. *ἄν* § 12.

4to. Cf. also Doederlein on Moods and Conjunctions, in his Reden u. Aufsätze. Erlangen 1843. 8vo. nr. 9.

¹ Modern Greek has, as is well known, wholly given up the Optative; and it is still a question how far it was used in the popular speech of the ancient Greeks. It is often the case that certain forms and constructions embodying refinements of the literary diction are persistently shunned by the people.

**Ἐβουλόμην* etc. *vellem*, (without *ἄν*), is to be explained somewhat differently, e.g. Acts xxv. 22 *Ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκούσαι* *I too should wish to hear the man* (the account of him having awakened my curiosity), Aristoph. ran. 866; Aeschin. Ctesiph. 274 b.; Arrian. Epict. 1, 19, 18; Lucian. dial. mort. 20, 4; abdic. 1; Char. 6, etc. There is expressed here, not a desire which has been active at some former time merely (under different circumstances) *volebam*, but a wish still felt by the speaker. This, however, is not stated directly (*volo*), for this can be done only when the performance is viewed as dependent solely on the will (1 Tim. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; Rom. xvi. 19, etc.); nor by means of *Ἐβουλόμην ἄν*, for this would imply the counterpart *but I will not*, Hm. partic. *ἄν* p. 66 sq., nor yet by the much weaker *βουλοίμην ἄν* (Xen. Oec. 299 6, 12; Krü. 163), *velim*, *I could wish*; but definitely: *I was wishing, wished*, that is, if it were proper, if thou wouldst permit it (and wish accordingly on this assumption), Bhdy. S. 374; Kühner II. 68, (a conditional clause, therefore, being understood).¹ So also Rom. ix. 3 *ἡ ὑπόμην γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου optarem ego* etc., and Gal. iv. 20, see my Comment. in loc. (It is otherwise in 2 Cor. i. 15; Philem. 13, 14, where the Aorists express what actually took place, and in 2 Jno. 12 *ἡ βουλήθην*.)

In Jno. iv. 4 etc. *ἔδει* is to be taken as a genuine Imperf. Indicative, denoting a real fact. On the contrary, in Heb. ix. 26 *ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν* the particle *ἄν* might have been expected, as something is expressed that according to a certain supposition must have taken place. The Codd., however, do not give it, and it can be omitted,—just as we say: *for* (otherwise), if that were the design, *he must have often suffered* (cf. Hm. Eurip. Bacch. p. 152; Bhdy. 390, see § 42, 2). In Rom. xi. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 14; v. 10, the Indicatives Pres. after *ἐπεὶ* (*otherwise*, *alioquin*) are usually rendered as Subjunctives. The meaning, however, of the first two passages is simply this: *then* (in that case i.e. if *ἐξ ἔργων*) *grace is no longer grace*; *then* (in case the husband is not sanctified in the wife) *are your children unclean*. But in 1 Cor. v. 10 nearly all the better Codd. [Sin. also] read *ὠφείλετε*. See, further, Ast, Plat. legg. p. 162 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 57.

In 1 Cor. vii. 7 *θελω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτὸν* the Indic.

¹ Schoemann ad Isaeum p. 435 takes a different view: Addita particula *ἄν* voluntatem significamus a conditione suspensam: *vellem, si liceret*; omissa autem particula etiam conditionis notio nulla subintelligitur, sed hoc potius indicatur, vere nos illud voluisse, etiamsi omittenda fuerit voluntas, scilicet quod frustra nos velle cognovimus. This nice distinction, however, might not be applicable to all passages.

θέλω is not used, as Pott maintains, for θέλοιμι or ἤθελον. Paul actually entertained this wish, directing his attention meantime merely to the advantage that would thus accrue to men (Christians), and not to the obstacles. Had he referred to the latter he must have said: *I could wish*, 267 or *I could have wished*, *velim* or *vellem*. Baumgarten has understood the 7th ed. passage correctly. In the same way we must explain 1 Cor. vii. 28, where φειδομαι is likewise explained by Pott as equivalent to φειδοίμην ἄν. All recent expositors have correctly explained 2 Cor. xii. 9 ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, which Luther inaccurately renders: *be satisfied with my grace*. The force of the Indicative has been exaggerated in another way in 1 Cor. v. 7: καθὼς ἐστε ἄζυμοι *esse debetis*; incorrectly, see Mey.

3. The Indicative Pres. sometimes occurs also b. in direct questions where in Latin the Subjunctive (in German the auxiliary verb *sollen*) would be used; as, Jno. xi. 47 τί ποιοῦμεν; ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος 300 πὸς πολλὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖ, *quid faciamus?* *what are we to do?* Lucian, pisc. 10; asin. 25. The Ind., however, here strictly denotes that something must undoubtedly be done (forthwith); so we say, *what are we doing?* more resolute and emphatic than *what shall we do?* Τί ποιῶμεν is the question of one who invites to deliberation (cf. Acts iv. 16); τί ποιοῦμεν, on the contrary, is the language of one who on behalf of those concerned assumes the determination not only in general *to do* something, but also to do something definite, and desires simply to draw out a declaration of the specific thing. [That this distinction is not artificial, as Bttm. Gramm. d. N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 180 asserts, has been justly acknowledged by Mey., also, in loc.] On this (rhetorical) Ind. Pres., which mainly occurs in conversation, see Heind. Plat. Gorg. p. 109 and Theaet. p. 449; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 141; Bhdy. 396.

The Greeks go still further, and even say πίνομεν *we drink* i.e. *we are to drink*, when they mean to proceed to drink forthwith, when the cup has been already lifted up (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 559). Gal. vi. 10 however, ἐργαζόμεθα τὸ ἀγαθόν, which is the reading 255 in good Codd. viz. AB and which Lehm. has printed [but only in 6th ed. his stereotyp. ed.] can hardly serve as an instance of this usage; see Mey. As to Jno. xxi. 3, cf. § 40, 2, p. 265.

The meaning of 1 Cor. x. 22 ἡ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον; which Schott still renders by the Subjunctive, is probably: *or do we provoke God?* is that the meaning of our conduct, to awaken God's wrath? παραζ. expresses, not what is still to take place (as Rück. takes it [and recently even Bttm. Gramm. d. N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 181 considers as not inappropriate]), but what is already actually taking place. Rom. viii. 24 ὁ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; is not (Schott) quare insuper speret? for dropping the question

the passage means, not. *he may no longer hope for*; but: *he no longer hopes for*. On the Ind. Fut. for the Subjunctive, see § 40, 6, p. 279.

The Indicatives in Jas. v. 13 *κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν, ... ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν*, denoting a case represented as real, are attended with no difficulty: *some one is afflicted among you, ... some one is sick among you*, etc. Demosth. cor. 351 c. (where a point of interrogation is not necessary, 268 Krü. 160). In Greek authors, even a Preterite is used in this way, 7th ed. Mtth. 1155.

4. The SUBJUNCTIVE is used in independent propositions

a. When an invitation or resolution (conjunct. adhortativus) is expressed (Mtth. 1169); as, Jno. xiv. 31 *ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν*, xix. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 32 *φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν*, Phil. iii. 15 *ὅσοι οὖν τέλειοι, τοῦτο φρονῶμεν*, 1 Thess. v. 6 *γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν*, Luke viii. 22. The Codd. occasionally vary between the Subjunct. and the Fut. Heb. vi. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Jas. iv. 13, but in the first two passages there is preponderating evidence in favor of the Subjunctive.

b. In undetermined questions (conjunct. deliberativus, Mtth. 1170; Bhdy. 396; Kühner II. 102 f.); as, Mark xii. 14 *δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν; shall we give or not give?* Rom. vi. 1 *ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*; 1 Cor. xi. 22; also in the 3d and 2d Pers., as Luke xxiii. 31 *εἰ ἐν τῷ ὕρῳ 301 ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιούσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται*; and Matt. xxvi. 54 *πῶς πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί*; *how shall the Scriptures be fulfilled?* xxiii. 33 *πῶς φύγητε* (Jno. v. 47 var.). Under this head comes the Subjunctive in certain set phrases; as, Luke ix. 54 *θέλεις εἰπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*; (Hm. de ellips. p. 183) *will thou that we, are we to bid etc.*, Matt. xiii. 28; xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 9. Cf. Eurip. Phoen. 722 *βούλει τράπωμαι δὴθ' ὁδοὺς ἄλλας τινάς*; Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 1 *βούλει σκοπῶμεν*; Aesch. Ctesiph. 237 c.; Lucian. dial. m. 20, 3. See also Matt. vii. 4 *ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος etc.* 1 Cor. iv. 21. It is a mistake to supply in such cases *ἵνα* or *ὅπως* (Lehmann, Lucian. III. 466). There is no ellipsis, any more than, for example, in the German *es scheint sie kommen*, *it seems they are coming*. In some passages, Codd. have the Fut., which, in these phrases, Greek authors do employ (Lucian. navig. 23), though not very frequently; see Lob. Phryn. p. 734, and Fr. Matt. p. 465, 761 (from the Sept. see Heb. viii. 5) cf. e.g. Exod. xxv. 40 *ὅρα ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον etc.*

In questions, the Future instead of the Conjunct. deliberativus of the 256 3d Pers. is, according to the testimony of the Codd., more frequent in the 6th ed. N. T., see above, § 40, 6, and is to be retained even in Rom. x. 14f.;

although in Greek authors the Subjunctive, in this person also, not unfrequently occurs (Stallb. Plat. Men. p. 103; Krü. 161): Soph. Aj. 403 ποῖ τις φύγη; Oed. Col. 170 ποῖ τις φροντίδος ἔλθῃ; (1st Pers. vs. 311); Plato, Soph. 225 a.; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 96. In Luke xi. 5 the Fut. Ind. and the Subjunctive are connected, τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐξεῖ φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτόν . . . καὶ εἴπῃ αὐτῷ; see Mtth. 1171; Hm. partic. ἄν p. 87; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 26 and Phaed. p. 202; Bornem. Luc. p. 147; Bmln. p. 182.

Respecting Jas. iv. 15 εἰ ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ζήσωμεν (ζήσομεν) καὶ ποιήσωμεν (ποιήσομεν) τοῦτο ἢ ἐκείνο a learned controversy has been carried on between Fritzsche (Leipz. Literatur-Zeit. 1824. S. 2316 and n. krit. Journ. V. S. 3 ff.) and Bornem. (n. krit. Journ. VI. S. 130 ff.). The former would make the conclusion begin at καὶ ποιήσομεν (adopting this as the preferable reading); the latter would make it begin at καὶ ζήσωμεν (retaining also ποιήσωμεν). Fritzsche renders the passage: *if the Lord will, and we live, we shall also do this or that*; Bornem.: *if it please the Lord let us seek our support, let us do this or that*. Every one must feel that there is something incongruous in the expression *if God will, we will live*; and B. himself has perceived this, as he translates ζήσ. *we will us life!* But this explanation appears forced, and not warranted by biblical usage. There is nothing remarkable in the occurrence of καὶ at the beginning of the apodosis (2 Cor. xi. 12). With regard to this, therefore, I must agree with Fr. But he should not have asserted that ποιήσομεν is far better attested than ζήσομεν. The critical authorities are nearly equal. Only from Cod. Meerm. (by Dermout) ποιήσομεν (but not ζήσομεν) has been adduced, [and Cod. Sin. has ποιήσομεν together with ζήσομεν]. Considering the ease with which a mistake in transcribing might occur, we should probably adopt as the most suitable reading: εἰ ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ζήσωμεν, καὶ ποιήσωμεν etc. (vs. 13).

5. The OPTATIVE is used in independent propositions when a wish is expressed; as, Acts viii. 20 τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν, Rom. xv. 5; Philem. 20 ἐγὼ σου ὀναίμην, 1 Pet. i. 2 2 Pet. i. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 11 f.; v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 5; (in 2 Cor. ix. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 7 the Futures are to be restored, as is the Imperat. λαβέτω in Acts i. 20). As to the Sept. see some remarks in Thiersch p. 101. Cf. 1 Kings viii. 57; Ps. xl. 3; Tob. v. 14; x. 12; xi. 16.

Instead of the Optative, the Hebrew frequently employs a question to denote a wish; as, 2 Sam. xv. 4 τίς με καταστήσει κριτὴν *utinam quis me constituat!* This construction, however, occurs also in Greek poets, Fr. Rom. II. 70. Yet it is on insufficient grounds that Rom. vii. 24 τίς μὲ ῥύσεται etc. has been taken as a wish expressed in the form of a question. A question expressive of perplexity and conscious helplessness is here peculiarly appropriate, and requires no μετὰ βας εἰς ἄλλο γένος.

b. USE OF THESE THREE MOODS IN DEPENDENT PROPOSITIONS. 257
6th ed.

1. The particles of *design* ἵνα and ὅπως (both which, however, strictly signify *quo modo*, *ut*; — respecting μή see below, § 56), are quite naturally construed with the Subjunctive and Optative (according to the distinction above pointed out between the two moods), as every design refers to the future, and, consequently, to something still to be carried into effect. The Indicative they can take — so long as the writer thinks correctly — only in the Future tense.¹

In the N. T. these particles are usually followed by

a. The Subjunctive, and then *a.* not only after the Present, as Matt. vi. 2 ποιούσιν ... ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 2 Tim. i. 4 οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις, ἵνα τῷ στρατολογήσαντι ἀρέσῃ, 10 πάντα ὑπομένω διὰ τ. ἐκλεκτούς, 270 ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας τύχωσι (Mark iv. 21; Luke viii. 12; Rom. 7th ed. xi. 25; 1 Jno. i. 3; Heb. ix. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Gal. vi. 13; the Subjunctive here denoting — Hm. Vig. 850 — what was regarded as a consequence actually about to take place, what was in fact and immediately designed, consequently what is objectively possible), and after the Imperat. and the Fut., as 1 Tim. iv. 15 ἐν τούτοις 303 σθι, ἵνα σου ἡ προκοπὴ φανερά ᾖ, Matt. ii. 8 ἀπαγγείλατέ μοι, ὅπως ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ, v. 16; xiv. 15; Acts viii. 19; xxiii. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 18; 1 Jno. ii. 28; Jno. v. 20 μείζονα τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαυμάζητε, Phil. i. 26, also after the Conjunct. adhort. or deliber., as in Rom. iii. 8; Luke xx. 14; Jno. vi. 5, etc., — all in accordance with the preceding remarks, and quite regular (Hm. Vig. 850); — but also *β.* after the Preterite, when the latter denotes a really past time² (cf. Gayler, de partic. gr. sermon. negat. p. 176 sq.), and there occasionally can be perceived a reason for selecting *this* mood instead of the Optative (Hm. Vig. 791; Krü. 186).³ Accordingly, in the following passages the Subjunctive may denote an action still *continuing* either in itself or in its results, or one frequently recurring (Hm. Vig. 850 and ad Eurip. Hecub. p. 7; Heind. Plat. Protag. § 29; Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 103;

¹ See, in general, *Frankes* in the Darmstädter Schulzeit. 1839. S. 1236 ff.; *Klotz*, Devar. II. 615 sqq.

² For where a Perfect has the sense of a Present, ἵνα or ὅπως with the Subjunctive cannot be surprising, Jno. vi. 38; Luke xvi. 26; Acts ix. 17; 1 Jno. v. 20.

³ Many other distinctions have been laid down by *Wex* in the epist. crit. ad Gesenium (Lips. 1831. 4to.) p. 22 sqq. The question arises, however, whether such nice distinctions are consistent with the character of a living language.

Ast, Plat. legg. p. 93; Klotz, Devar. II. 618): 1 Tim. i. 16 ἡλεήθη ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρώτῳ ἐνδείξηται Ἰ. Χριστὸς τὴν πᾶσαν μακροθυμίαν vs. 20 οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ σατανᾷ, ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν Tit. i. 5 κατέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ ii. 14 ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς, Rom. vi. 4 συνετύφημεν αὐτῷ, ἵνα . . . καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καυνότητι ζωῆς περὶ πατὴρσωμεν, 1 Jno. iii. 5 ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀρῇ 258 vs. 8 ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου, v. 13 ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῇτε; cf. Luke i. 4 (Plat. Crit. 43 b.; rep. 9, 472 c.; leg. 6th ed. 2, 653 d.; Xen. Mem. 1, 1, 8; Aelian. 12, 30). In other passages e.g. Acts v. 26 ἤγαγεν αὐτούς . . . ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν, Acts ix. 1 εἰς τοῦτο ἐληλύθει, ἵνα . . . ἀγάγῃ, the Subjunctive may denote the intended result of the occurrence of which the speaker entertains no doubt whatever; cf. Mark viii. 6 ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραβῶσι (that they might . . . which they could not refuse to do xii. 2; Acts xxv. 26 προήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐφ' ὑμῶν, ὅπως τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης σχῶ τί γράψω. (The Optative would express a design of uncertain result, Mtth. 1182, 1184.) Lastly, the construction in Matt. xix. 13 πρὸς ἡνέχθη αὐτῷ τὰ παιδία, ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ 271 αὐτοῖς, Mark x. 13 προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἄψῃται αὐτῶν 7th ed. perhaps to be explained by the fact that the Greeks in narrative sometimes introduce the opinions of another in direct discourse, at least as though he himself were still present, and consequently employ the same moods which he would have used (Heind. Plat. Protag. p. 502, 504; Poppo, Xen. Cyrop. p. 189 sq. and Thuc. I. 141 sq.); so here: that he may lay his hands upon them, instead of might lay (Optative). The reader is thus more vividly made as it were a beholder of the scene described (Klotz, as above, p. 618 sq. 682); cf. Jno. xviii. 28; Matt. xii. 14. As, however, the Optative never occurs in the N. T. in this (β.) very common construction, we are by no means warranted in ascribing to the sacred writers this nice distinction. They seem, rather, to have unconsciously avoided the Optative — a mood which becomes more and more rare in the later language, and in the popular speech perhaps never conformed to the rules of literary Attic — even when a more cultivated taste in such matters would have certainly given it the preference (e.g. Jno. iv. 8; vii. 32; Luke vi. 7; xix. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 6; Heb. ii. 14; xi. 35; Phil. ii. 27, etc.). Even Plutarch, in the above construction, usually employs the Subjunctive

¹ Even in the earlier authors particles of design are more frequently construed with the Subjunctive after a Preterite than was formerly admitted. See Bremi, Lys. exc. p. 435 sqq.

and in the Hellenistic language it is everywhere the predominant mood, as may be seen from every page of the Sept., Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, etc. (Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 47).

b. The Indicative Future (after a Pres. and Perf. cf. Hm. Vig. 851); as, Rev. xxii. 14 *μακάριοι οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ἔσται ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν* etc. (the Subjunctive immediately follows), iii. 9; vi. 11; xiv. 13 (var.); Jno. xvii. 2 *ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν . . . ἵνα . . . δώσει αὐτοῖς* (al. *δώσῃ*), 1 Pet. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xiii. 3 (var); Gal. ii. 4 (var.). Compare, further, the variants in Rev. viii. 3; ix. 20; xiii. 16; xiv. 13, (on the other hand, in the O. T. quotation Eph. vi. 3 the construction is continued in the oratio directa at *ἔσῃ*, which accordingly must not be supposed to depend on *ἵνα*. In the same way may be explained also the var. *ἐξαναστήσει* and *καθίσessθε* in Mark xii. 19 and Luke xxii. 30). The Fut. with *ὅπως* never occurs in the N. T. (for *ὅπως . . . ζήσεται* Mark v. 23 has little authority); but this is a construction not unfrequent in 259 Greek authors, as Xen. A. 3, 1, 18; Theophr. char. 22; Isocr. 6th ed. perm. 746; Dem. Mid. 398 b.; Soph. Philoct. 55; cf. Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 498; Klotz as above, p. 683 sq.; Gayler de partic. negat. p. 211, 321; Rost 647 f., and the Fut. then usually denotes a *continuing* state, while the Aor. Subjunct. is used of something quickly passing by. This construction with *ἵνα* also appears correct to Elmsley, Eurip. Bacch. p. 164; see, on the other hand, 305 Hm. Soph. Oed. Col. 155, and de partic. *ἄν* p. 134; Klotz, Devar. II. 630 — (in all the passages referred to this head *ἵνα* may be 272 conveniently rendered by *ubi* or *where*). Instances of this construction actually occur in the later writers (Cedren. II. 136), the Fathers (Epiph. II. 332 b.), and the Apocrypha (Evang. apocr. p. 437; Thilo, apocr. 682); cf. Schaef. Demosth. IV. 273. In the N. T. this mood, according to the above passages, is pretty well established, though owing to Itacism the forms of the Ind. and of the Subj. might easily have been interchanged.

c. Lastly, the use of *ἵνα* in connection with the Present Ind.,¹ of which two instances occur almost without var. — 1 Cor. iv. 6 *ἵνα μάθητε . . . ἵνα μὴ φυσιολογήσῃτε*, and Gal. iv. 17 *ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς . . . ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε*, — is very surprising; for the Pres. Ind. after a particle of design seems illogical. Hence Fr. Matt. p. 836 sq. asserted that in both passages *ἵνα* is not the Conjunction, but the Adverb *ubi*; and this opinion, after Fr. had exchanged it as respects the

¹ Valckenaer's note on 1 Cor. confounds the Indic. Preterite, Future, and Present, and is consequently useless.

first passage for another (Fritzschior. Opusc. p. 186 sqq.),¹ Mey. has taken up again: *under which circumstances you (then) are not puffed up*,—where (in which case) *you are zealous in regard to them*. But, apart from the fact that in the whole Greek Bible *ἵνα* never once occurs as an Adverb of place, the Pres. in both passages would be surprising, and also in the first passage οὐ would rather be expected. Moreover in both passages, as Mey. himself admits, *ἵνα* denoting design is far more in accordance with the Apostle's meaning. I think, therefore, that this use of *ἵνα* with the Ind. Pres. must be regarded as an impropriety of later Greek,²—although the passage from Acta Ignat. ed. Ittig. p. 538 does not furnish satisfactory proof, as ἀπολούνται might be taken for the Attic Fut. if necessary, and in Geopon. 10, 48, 3; Himer. 15, 3 the Ind. may have arisen easily from the Subjunct. by a mistake of the scribe. On the other hand, in later works *ἵνα* with the Ind. Pres. occurs so frequently as to preclude the supposition that every instance is a mistake of transcribers; see Malal. 10, p. 264 ἐπιτρέψας ἵνα πάντες . . . βαστάξουσιν, 12, p. 300 ἐποίησε κέλευσιν ἵνα . . . χρηματίζουσι, Acta Pauli et Petri 7 προάγει, ἵνα μία πόλις ἀπόλλυται, 20 ἐδίδαξα

306 ἵνα τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούνται, Acta Pauli et Thecl. p. 45 ἵνα
 260 γάμοι μὴ γίνονται ἀλλὰ οὕτως μένουσιν, Evang. apocr. p. 447.³ And
 6th ed. this construction has further forced its way even into the N. T.,

273 good Codd. having in Jno. xvii. 3 ἵνα . . . γινώσκουσι. [Cf. besides,
 7th ed. Gal. vi. 12 ἵνα μὴ διώκονται, Tit. ii. 4 ἵνα σωφρονίζουσιν, Rev. xiii. 17
 ἵνα μὴ τις δύναται in Tischendorf's text, and 2 Pet. i. 10 ἵνα ποιείσθε
 in Lachmann's.] Either, therefore, Paul actually wrote thus (yet
 see Bengel on 1 Cor. iv.), or the forms were introduced in these
 passages by transcribers at an early date. It is worthy of remark,
 however the case may be, that in both instances the verb ends in *σω*.

When the Optative (after a Pres.) follows *ἵνα*, as in Eph. iii. 16 κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου . . . ἵνα δόξῃ ὑμῖν etc. (where, however, very good Codd. [Sin. too] have δῶ) i. 17, *ἵνα* is not strictly a particle of design; but the clause which it commences expresses the object of the wish and prayer (*that he may give*), and the Opt., as *modus optandi*, is selected on this very account; see Harless on Eph. i. 17. Yet the Opt. is used even after *ἵνα* or ὅπως in order that, when it depends on a clause

¹ He adopts the emendation *ἵνα μὴ . . . φουσιῶσθαι* (for *ἵνα μὴ . . . φουσιῶσθε*); but against this see Meyer.

² Modern Greek, e.g. in the Confess. Orthod., usually puts the Ind. Present after *καὶ* or *διὰ καὶ*.

³ Xen. Athen. 1, 11 ἵνα λαμβάνων μὲν πράττει (which Sturz still adduces in his Lexic. Xenoph.) was long ago changed into λαμβάνωμεν πράττει. See Schneider in loc.

expressive of a wish, Soph. Philoct. 325 and Aj. 1200; see Hm. on the latter passage, and Wex, epist. crit. p. 33. (In Eph. as above, it is unnecessary, with Lehm. and Fr. Rom. III. 230, to read $\delta\omega\eta$, an Ionic form of the Subjunctive which is not sufficiently established in the N. T.)

2. In HYPOTHETICAL sentences four kinds of construction occur (Hm. Vig. 834, 902):¹

a. Pure condition: *if thy friend comes, give him my regards* (the case is put as real). Here the Indicative is used with $\epsilon\iota$; "quae particula per se nihil significat praeter conditionem," Klotz, Devar. 455, cf. p. 487.

b. Condition with assumption of *objective* possibility (where experience will decide whether or not it is real): *if thy friend come* (I do not know whether he will come, but the result will show). Here $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ($\epsilon\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ see Hm. partic. $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ p. 95 sqq.) with the Subjunctive is used.

c. Condition with assumption of *subjective* possibility, the condition existing merely in thought: *if thy friend should come* (the case being conceivable and credible) *I should be pleased to present my respects to him*. Here $\epsilon\iota$ with the Optative is used.

d. Condition believed to be contrary to the fact: *were there a God, he would govern* (but there is not). *Had God existed from eternity, he would have prevented evil* (but he has not existed). Here $\epsilon\iota$ with the Indicative is used, — the Imperf. in the first case, the Aor. or (much more rarely) the Plup. in the second (Krü. 170); in the conclusion likewise one of these two tenses. Why a Preterite is used has been explained by Hm. Vig. 821, compare with this Stallb. 614 d Plat. Euthyphr. p. 51 sq. In general, see Klotz, Devar. p. 450 sqq.

For $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ we sometimes find, as in Jno. xii. 32; xvi. 33; xx. 23; Luke iv. 7 (where, however, Tdf. has made no remark), in good Codd. (as B) $\acute{\alpha}\nu$, respecting which cf. Hm. Vig. 812, 822. It is also by no means rare in Greek authors, even in Attic, though these prefer $\tilde{\eta}\nu$, which does not occur in the N. T.

¹ See also ad Soph. Antig. 706; ad Soph. Oed. C. 1445; ad Eur. Bacch. 200. Klossmann, de ratione et usu enuntiator. hypothet. linguae gr. Vratil. 1830. Kiesling, 2 Programm. de enunciatis hypothet. in lingua gr. et lat. Cizae, 1835. '45. 4to. Recknagel, zur Lehre von den hypothetischen Sätzen mit Rücksicht auf die Grundformen derselben in der griech. Sprache. Nürnberg, 1843 ff. III. 4to. Besides, it can easily be conceived that, in many sentences, either $\epsilon\iota$ or $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ might be used with equal propriety, the selection depending on the writer. The later writers are not careful to discriminate between them. It may be worthy of remark, that Enclid almost always uses $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ with the Subjunctive of a case in Mathematics (respecting which no future experience is needed to decide).

The diction of the N. T. will be found entirely in accordance with the preceding rules; e.g.

a. a. Matt. xix. 10 *εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ... οὐ συμφέρει γαμήσαι*, 1 Cor. vi. 2; ix. 17; Rom. viii. 25; Col. ii. 5 (Pres. followed by Pres.); Matt. xix. 17 *εἰ θέλεις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν, τήρει τὰς ἐντολάς*, viii. 31; xxvii. 40; Jno. vii. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 9 (Pres. followed by Imperat.); Rom. viii. 11 *εἰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν ... οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας ... ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα, ὑμῶν*, Matt. xvii. 4; Acts xix. 39; Jno. v. 47 (Pres. followed by Fut.); 1 Cor. xv. 16 *εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται* *if the dead do not rise* (I assume the case), *then is Christ also not risen*, xiii. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 20 (Rom. iv. 14) (Pres. followed by Perf.) cf. Demosth. ep. 3, p. 114 b.; Matt. xii. 26 *εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη*, cf. vs. 28; Luke xi. 20 (Pres. followed by Aor.) cf. Orig. de die domin. p. 3 Jani: *εἰ δὲ τοῦ ἔργου ἀπέχεις, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν δὲ οὐκ εἰσέρχῃ, οὐδὲν ἐκέδανας*. β. Acts xvi. 15 *εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶναι, εἰσελθόντες ... μείνατε* (Perf. followed by Imperat.); 2 Cor. v. 16 *εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν* (Perf. followed by Pres.; cf. Demosth. c. Boeot. p. 639 a.); Jno. xi. 12 *εἰ κεκοιμηται, σωθήσεται* (Perf. followed by Fut.), Rom. vi. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 5 *εἰ τις λελύπηκεν, οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν* (Perf. followed by Perf.); vii. 14 *εἰ τι αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κεκαύχημαι, οὐ κατησχύνθη* (Perf. followed by Aor.). γ. Rom. xv. 27 *εἰ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν*
 308 *ἐκοινωνήσαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι etc.*, 1 Jno. iv. 11 (Aor. followed by Pres.); Jno. xviii. 23 *εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα, μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ*, Rom. xi. 17, 18; Col. iii. 1; Philem. 18 (Aor. followed by Imperat.); Jno. xiii. 32 *εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν*
 262 *ἐαυτῷ*, xv. 20¹ (Aor. followed by Fut.). δ. Matt. xxvi. 33 *εἰ*

8th ed.

¹ In this passage: *εἰ ἐμὲ ἰδίῳξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν· εἰ τὸν λόγον μου ἐτήρησαν, καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον τηρήσουσι*, the translation *if they persecuted me, they will persecute you also*, etc. is the only correct one. The words appear to me to be simply a special application of the preceding thought, *οὐκ ἔστι δούλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ*: your lot will be like mine; there is but a single alternative: persecution or acceptance. The words themselves leave it for the moment undecided which of the two has befallen Jesus. What follows, however, shows how Jesus wished to be understood. Only it must not be overlooked that Jesus speaks of the conduct of the Jews in general, without reference to individual exceptions. According to a new exposition put forth by rector *Lehmann* in the *Prog. lucubrationum sacrar. et profan. Pt. I.* (Lühben, 1828. 4to.) a *vis proportionalis* is to be attributed to *εἰ*: *quemadmodum me persecuti sunt, ita et vos persequentur*; *quemadmodum* (prout) *meam doctrinam amplexi observarunt, ita et vestram*, etc. But this import of the particle should have been established by decisive examples (in Jno. xiii. 14, 32 such force it obviously has not). The writer seems to have confounded the simple comparative *ut ... ita* (the parallel antithesis of two clauses standing in necessary correlation) with the proportional *prout, according as*. There is a difference between

πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι 275
(Fut. followed by Fut. like Isocr. Archid. p. 280; Porphy. abstin. 7th ed.
1, 24); yet in Jas. ii. 11, where according to the received text
the Fut. is followed by the Perf., probably the true reading would
give Present tenses in the protasis. Such construction with the
Fut. would approximate most nearly to that with ἐάν (Krü. 171);
but *if all shall be offended in thee* is a more decided statement than
if all should be offended. In the latter, it is still altogether uncer-
tain whether they will be offended; in the former, this is assumed
as a future fact (Christ has distinctly assured his disciples of this),
cf. Hm. Vig. p. 900.

b. *Ἐάν* if an *objective* possibility with the expectation of a decision
is to be expressed, always therefore in reference to something future
(Hm. Vig. 834); as, Jno. vii. 17 ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν,
γινώσεται etc., Matt. xxviii. 14 ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος,
ἡμεῖς πείσομεν αὐτόν. Hence the consequent clause usually contains
a Fut. (Matt. v. 13; Rom. ii. 26; 1 Cor. viii. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 15;
or, what is equivalent, an Aor. with οὐ μή Acts xiii. 41; Jno.
viii. 51 f.) or an Imperat. (Jno. vii. 37; Matt. x. 13; xviii. 17;
Rom. xli. 20; xlii. 4), more rarely a Pres., and then either in the
sense of a Fut. (Xen. A. 3, 2, 20) or denoting something permanent,
Matt. xviii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 1, or a general truth, Mark iii. 27; 1 Cor.
ix. 16; Jno. viii. 16, 54; Acts xv. 1 (Diog. Laert. 6, 44; 10, 152).
Perfects in the conclusion become equivalent in sense to Presents, 309
Rom. ii. 25; vii. 2; Jno. xx. 23 (on Rom. xiv. 23 and Jno. xv. 6
see § 40, 4 b. 5 b.). The Aor. in the conclusion occurs in 1 Cor.
vii. 28 ἐὰν δὲ καὶ γήμης, οὐχ ἡμαρτες thou hast not sinned, thou art
not in this case a sinner. Cf. Mth. 1203; Klotz, Devar. II. 451 sq.
The Subjunctive depending on ἐάν may be a Subj. Pres. or a Subj.
Aor. The latter (on the whole the more usual) is, for the most
part, rendered in Latin by the Future Perfect.

That ἐάν 1 Cor. vii. 11, as Rück. maintains, refers to an event (possibly)
already past, is a mistake, cf. Mey. In 2 Cor. x. 8 also Mey. has corrected
Rückert's concessive acceptance of ἐάν.

c. *Εἰ* with the Optat. to denote *subjective* possibility (Hm. partic.
ἀν p. 97); and, a. When a condition is regarded as frequently re-
curring (Klotz p. 492; Krü. 172), as 1 Pet. iii. 14 εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε

the two: In a free translation the first may be put for *ei*, but the latter is not compre-
hended in the import of *ei* or *si*; and every one must perceive that in the passage in
question *L.* really takes *ei* in two senses, first simply as *ut* and then as *prout*. See also
Lücke in loc.

διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι *even if ye should suffer*. Πάσχειν is designated here not as something occurring in the future, but merely as something that may very probably occur, regarded without any reference to definite time (and in general as often as it may occur).
 276 Elsewhere only in parenthetical clauses, but with the same reference;
 7th ed. as, 1 Cor. xv. 37 σπείρεις . . . γυμνὸν κόκκον, εἰ τύχοι (*if it should*
 263 *so chance*), σίτου (Dem. Aristocr. 436 c.; Lucian. navig. 44; amor. 42;
 6th ed. Toxar. 4, see Jacob on the last passage, and Wetst. on 1 Cor. xv.),
 1 Pet. iii. 17 κρείττον ἀγαθοποιούντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ,
 πάσχειν, cf. Isocr. Nicocl. p. 52. β. After a Preterite when the
 condition is represented as the subjective purpose of the agent; as,
 Acts xxvii. 39 κόλπον τινα κατενόουν ἔχοντα αἰγιαλὸν εἰς ὃν ἐβουλεύοντο,
 εἰ δύναιντο, ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον, also Acts xxiv. 19 οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ
 παρῆναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν, εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς με *if they had anything*
against me (in their minds), Krü. 171. In Acts xx. 16 the Optat.
 might, in the same way, be expected; yet even in Greek authors
 sometimes (and that not merely in standing phrases, as εἰ δυνατόν
 ἐστὶ above) in orat. obliq. the Ind. is used; as, Ael. 12, 40 ἐκκρύχθη
 τῷ στρατοπέδῳ, εἴ τις ἔχει ὕδωρ ἐκ τοῦ Χοάσπου, ἵνα δῶ βασιλεῖ
 πιεῖν. cf. Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 156. Further, see no. 5 below.
 (After εἰ in orat. obliq. nobody will expect the Opt. in the N. T.
 Acts ix. 2; Jno. ix. 22; xi. 57, Bttm. § 126, 8; yet cf. Hm.
 Vig. 822.)

For examples to d. see § 42.

- 310 The exceptions to these rules in the N. T. text are but very few, and occur for the most part only in particular Codd. They are the following:
- a) εἰ is used with the Subjunctive¹ in 1 Cor. ix. 11 εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσωμεν (according to good Codd.), xiv. 5 ἐκτός εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ (al. διερμηνεύει) *except (in case that) he interpret*, Rev. xi. 5 var. (Sir. xxii. 26).² The use of this mood after εἰ by Attic authors was long denied, but it is now admitted to occur even in prose; see Hm. Soph. Aj. 491 and de partic. ἄν p. 96; Poppo, Cyrop. p. 209 and Emend. ad Mith. Gramm. (Frkf. on the Oder, 1832) p. 17; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 463; Klotz, Devar. II. 500 sqq. The distinction between εἰ with the Subjunctive and εἰάν or

¹ Luke ix. 13 probably means: *unless perhaps we are to buy* some, and the mood does not depend on εἰ, — as elsewhere after the phrase ὥστε εἰ ἄν Mith. 1205. Plat. Cratyl. 425 d. εἰ μὴ ἄρα δὴ . . . καὶ ἡμεῖς . . . ἀπαλλαγόμεν would be similar; but others read ἀπαλλαγείμεν.

² In 1 Thess. v. 10 the text. rec. with all the better Codd. [Sin. also], has ἵνα, εἴτε γρηγορώμεν εἴτε καθεύδωμεν, ἕμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ζήσωμεν, where (after a Pret. in the principal clause) a more exact writer would have used the Opt. in both passages; cf. Xen. A. 2, 1, 14. Yet ἵνα with the Subj. is here used according to b. 1, and the Subj. in the secondary clause is accommodated to this.

$\tilde{\eta}$ is thus defined by Hm. (de partic. $\tilde{\alpha}$ p. 97 and ad Soph. Oed. R. p. 52 sq. cf. Klotz as above 501) : $\epsilon\iota$ puts the condition simply, but when used with the Subjunctive represents it as depending on the result; $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ also does the latter, but less decisively, inasmuch as the $\tilde{\alpha}$ represents the condition as dependent on accidental circumstances, *if anyhow* or *perhaps*. This will suit both the passages above quoted : $\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \epsilon\iota \mu\grave{\eta} \delta\iota\epsilon\rho\mu\eta\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta \nu\iota\sigma\iota \sigma\iota$ ²⁷⁷ *interpretetur*, on which the result will decide, *refertur ad certam spem* ^{7th ed.} atque opinionem, futurum id esse (vel non esse). On the other hand, $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ²⁶⁴ *would make the matter doubtful : unless he perhaps*, which may be the ^{6th ed.} case, *interpret*. This would be manifestly unsuitable, as the gift of interpreting did exist, and was frequently exercised, vs. 26 f. In later prose this Subjunctive became more and more frequent (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 681 and Athen. p. 146; Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 185; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 53; Jacobitz, Index p. 473; Schaef. Ind. ad Aesop. p. 131), particularly in Byzantine authors (Index to Malalas and Theophanes), also in the Hellenistic writings (Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 23), and almost uniformly in the Canon. Apost. and the Basilic. (in the Sept. cf. Gen. xliii. 3, 4). In these writers a fixed distinction between $\epsilon\iota$ with the Subj. and the same particle with the Ind., cannot be traced, (many doubt whether such a distinction existed even in Attic, Rost S. 632; cf. Mtth. 1210 f.); consequently it is uncertain whether Paul had in view the nice discrimination specified above.

b) $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is followed by the Indicative (Klotz p. 468), and not only — α . by the Ind. Present (Sept. Lev. i. 14; Acta apocr. 259) according to good Codd. in Rom. xiv. 8 $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \alpha\pi\theta\eta\eta\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu, \tau\tilde{\omega} \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega \alpha\pi\theta\eta\nu$, a general truth : *cum morimur* (without reference to the fact that time will decide whether we die or not), 1 Thess. iii. 8 (in Gal. i. 8 the Ind. has little authority),¹ or ³¹¹ Future, Jno. viii. 36 $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta \upsilon\omicron\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma\epsilon\iota$, Acts viii. 31 (where, however, there is preponderant authority for the Subj.), Luke xi. 12 $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \alpha\iota\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota \acute{\omega}\nu$ according to many uncial Codd. *cum petet*, not *petierit*, vi. 34; see Klotz pp. 470, 472 sq. The same (cf. Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 678, 687) occurs several times, as in Exod. viii. 21 (Lev. iv. 3), Malalas 5, p. 136; Cantacuz. 1, 6, p. 30; 1, 54, p. 273 (Basilic. I. 175; Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 23; Schaef. ind. ad Aesop. p. 131), in which passages, to be sure, forms so slightly distinguished from each other hardly permit a positive decision; — but also, β . by the Ind. Preterite, as in 1 Jno. v. 15 $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \omicron\iota\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ without var. cf. Ephraemius 6298 (even when the Pret. is strictly Pret. in signification, as in Job xxii. 3; Theodoret. III. 267; Malalas 4, p. 71 $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta \eta\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$, Nili ep. 3, 56 $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, Ephraem. 5251), see Jacobs, Act. Monac. I. 147; cf. Hase, Leon. Diac. p. 143; Schaef. ad Bastii ep. crit. p. 26; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 313 and III. II. 172.²

¹ In all these passages the form might easily have arisen from a mistake in transcribing (*Fr. Rom. III. 179*); *Klotz* p. 471 sqq. has, however, adduced examples from good writers to which this would not apply.

² Editors of early writers have usually corrected such passages (see also *Bhdy. Dionys.*

Sometimes *ἐάν* and *εἰ* are connected in two parallel clauses; as, Acts v. 38, 39 *ἐάν ᾗ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἢ βουλὴ αὐτῇ ᾗ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο, καταλυθήσεται* (*should it be from men, and this the result will show*), *εἰ δὲ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστιν, οὐ δύνασθε καταλῦσαι αὐτό* (if it is of God, — a case I assume), Luke xiii. 9
 278 *κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν . . . εἰ δὲ μήγε . . . ἐκκύψεις si fructus tulerit; . . . sin*
 14 ed *minus (si non fert)* etc. (Plat. rep. 7, 540 d.), Gal. i. 8 f.; see Hm. Vig. 834; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 143; Weber, Dem. p. 473. Cf. Her. 3, 36; Xen. 265 C. 4, 1, 15; Plat. Phaed. 93 b.; Isocr. Evag. p. 462; Lucian. dial. m. 6, 3; 64 ed Dio Chr. 69, 621. In most cases of this nature *εἰ* or *ἐάν* repeated might be used with equal propriety, though the choice of the one conjunction or the other would obviously proceed from a different conception of the relation; see Fr. Conject. I. 25. In two mutually subordinate clauses *εἰ* and *ἐάν* are distinguished from each other in Jno. xiii. 17 *εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε, ἐάν ποιῇτε αὐτά, if ye know . . . in case ye do*, and 1 Cor. vii. 36 *εἰ τις ἀσχημονεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον αὐτοῦ νομίζει, ἐάν ᾗ ὑπέρακμος* etc. Rev. ii. 5; cf. Krü. 172.

3. *Particles of time* (Krü. 175) which 1) in narration denote a definite past event (*when, while, etc.*) are naturally construed with the Indicative Pret. or historical Pres.; as *ὅτε* Matt. vii. 28; ix. 25; Mark xi. 1; xiv. 12; Luke iv. 25; 1 Cor. xiii. 11; *ὥς* Matt. 312 xxviii. 9; Luke i. 23; vii. 12; Jno. iv. 40; Acts xvi. 4, etc., *ὁπότε* Luke vi. 3, *ἡνίκα* 2 Cor. iii. 15 (Lehm. and Tdf.) cf. Klotz p. 613. So likewise *ἕως* and *ἕως οὗ*¹ Matt. i. 25; ii. 9; Jno. ix. 18; Acts xxi. 26, etc.; Mtth. 1197 f. Those which 2) denote a future event (*when, as soon as, until*) likewise govern, a) if they refer to a distinctly conceived event, the Indicative (Fut.); as, Jno. iv. 21 *ἔρχεται ὥρα, ὅτε . . . προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρὶ*, Luke xvii. 22 *ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε*, xiii. 35; Jno. v. 25; xvi. 25; see Hm. Vig. 915. After *ἕως* the Pres. Ind. is in a few instances used for the Fut. (§ 40, 2); as, Jno. xxi. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 13 *ἕως ἔρχομαι* (like *ἕως ἐπάνεισιν* Plut. Lycurg. c. 29).² The Pres. Ind. after *ὅτε*

p. 851), sometimes without MS. authority (Arist. anim. 7, 4 p. 210 Sylb.). On the other hand, we find in Dinarch. c. Philocl. 2, even in Bekker's edition, *ἐάν . . . εἴληφε*, which, according to Klotz's remarks, is not to be altered.

¹ This phrase (equivalent to our *until*) is not peculiar to later prose, except when used without *ἕν*. Even in Her. 2, 143 we find *ἕως οὗ ἀπέδεξαν*, and in Xen. A. 1, 7, 6; 5, 4, 16 etc., *μέχρις οὗ*, so frequently in Plutarch., more fully *μέχρι τούτου, ἕως οὗ* Palaeph. 4, 2.

² In the sense of *as long as*, *ἕως* denoting something actual is used as naturally with the Ind. Jno. ix. 4 (xii. 35 var.; Plat. Phaed. 89 c.; Xen. C. 1, 6, 9; 7, 2, 22; Plutarch. educ. 9, 27 etc.; Klotz, Devar. II. 565). The same mood is used after the Imperat. in Matt. v. 25 *ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχύ, ἕως ἔσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ*, where the Subjunctive might have been expected, as a merely possible case is indicated. This statement, however, contains a general truth, in which the case in question is represented

differs from this. That is employed in general truths; as, Jno. ix. 4 ἔρχεται νῦν ὅτε (i.e. ἐν ᾗ) οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάεσθαι, Heb. ix. 17 ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει (διαθήκη), ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος, see Hm. as above, 915. b) If, however, the future event is only (objectively) possible, though viewed as under certain circumstances sure to take place, the Subjunctive with a particle of time compounded with ἄν (ὅταν, ἐπὶ, ἡνίκα ἄν) is usually employed, see § 42. The same construction is used, when the particle of time indicates a duration or a future repetition (ὅταν, ὁσάκις ἄν), or a point of time till which something is to continue (ἕως ἄν) Mtth. 1199. In the latter case, however, the Subjunctive alone with ἕως, ἕως οὐ, ἄχρι, πρὶν, etc. often occurs, particularly in the later authors; as, Mark xiv. 32 καθίσατε ὧδε, ἕως προσεύξωμαι until I shall have prayed, 2 Pet. i. 19 καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες . . . ἕως οὐ ἡμέρα διανύσῃ, Luke xiii. 8 ἄφες αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος, ἕως ὅτου σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν, xii. 50; xv. 4; xxi. 24; xxii. 16; xxiv. 49 (Heb. x. 13); 2 Thess. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xi. 26; xv. 25; Gal. iii. 19; Eph. iv. 13; Luke ii. 26 μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, πρὶν ἢ ἰδῇ τὸν Χριστόν. See Plutarch. Cat. min. 59 ἄχρις οὐ τὴν ἐσχάτην τύχην τῆς πατρίδος ἐξελέγξωμεν, Caes. 7 μέχρις οὐ καταπολεμηθῇ Κατιλίνας, Plato, Eryx 392 c.; Aesch. dial. 2, 1; Lob. Phryn. p. 14 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 61 sq.; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 369 sq.; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 568. The lucid distinction which Hm. lays down, part. ἄν p. 109 sq. (restricting it, however, immediately, p. 111) cf. Klotz, Devar. 568, however easily it finds support in the preceding passages, would vanish again as respects the N. T. on a comparison of the passages with ἕως ἄν § 42, 5. In Rev. xx. 5 οἱ λοιποὶ . . . οὐκ ἔζησαν, ἕως τελεσθῇ τὰ χίλια ἔτη does not mean, till they were completed (narratively), but is a concise expression: they remained (and remain) dead, till the thousand years shall be completed. 3) The Opt. (without ἄν) occurs but once in the N. T. after a particle of time in orat. obliq. Acts xxv. 16 οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαι τινα ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἀπόλειαν, πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχοι τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας, τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι etc. See Klotz p. 727. In other places, where this mood might be expected, we find the Subjunctive, as in Matt. xiv. 22; Acts xxiii. 12, 14, 21; Mark ix. 9; Luke ii. 26; Rev. vi. 11; this may be in part accounted for by a blending of the orat. recta and obliqua, see below, no. 5. With

as real. On the other hand, in Luke xvii. 8 διακόνει μοι, ἕως φάγω καὶ πίω (ἄν is omitted in the better Codd. [Sin. also]) the Subjunctive is employed in reference to an uncertain limit in the future.

Matt. as above, cf. Thuc. 1, 137 τὴν ἀσφάλειαν εἶναι μηδὲν ἐκβῆναι ἐκ τῆς νεώς, μέχρι πλοῦς γένηται, Alciph. 3, 64; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 142; Krü. 177. Once indeed in such a case, Mark vi. 45 (which Fr. has left wholly unnoticed), the Indicative even is fully established, which is to be accounted for in a similar way; see Mey.

In Luke xiii. 35 ἔως ἤξει, ὅτε εἴπητε the Subjunctive is joined also with ὅτε, a construction that could hardly be vindicated by Attic prose (Klotz 688); but (de eventu) it is not incorrect: *quando dixeritis*. The Ind. Fut. would be more suitable in the mouth of Christ, and would correspond better to ἤξει (Diod. S. Exc. Vat. 103, 31 Lips.). Besides, compare as to ὅτε with the Subjunctive, Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 100 and in Act. Monac. I. II. 147.

4. INTERROGATIVES in indirect questions are construed,

- 280 a. With the *Indicative*, when the question refers to a matter of
7th ed. fact i.e. to the existence of something (*is it? is it not?*) or to the condition of something existing (*how? where? wherefore?* etc.), whether the principal clause contain a Pres. or a Pret. (Plut. Arist. 7; Xen. A. 2, 6, 4; Plat. Phil. 22 a.; rep. 1, 330 e.; conv. 194 e.; Diog. L. 2, 69; Klotz, Devar. 508); as, Mark xv. 44 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν, Matt. xxvi. 63; Jno. i. 40 εἶδον ποῦ μένει, 267 Mark v. 16 διεγῆσαντο αὐτοῖς, πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ, Acts
6th ed. xx. 18 ἐπίστασθε . . . πῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐγενόμην (he had actually
314 been with them), 1 Thess. i. 9 ἀπαγγέλλουσιν, ὅποιαν εἰσδον ἔσχον μὲν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Jno. ix. 21 πῶς νῦν βλέπει, οὐκ οἶδαμεν, vs. 15; x. 6 οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τίνα ἦν ἃ ἐλάλει *what it was* (meant), iii. 8; vii. 27; xx. 13; Acts v. 8; xii. 18; xv. 36; xix. 2; Luke xxiii. 6; Col. iv. 6; Eph. i. 18; 1 Cor. i. 16; iii. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 15, also Jno. ix. 25 (where ἀμαρτωλὸν εἶναι had been asserted): whether he *is* a sinner or not. In such instances the Latin language, as is well known, taking a different view of the case employs the Subjunctive.¹ The tense of the direct question is introduced into an indirect question in Acts x. 18 ἐπυνθάνετο, εἰ Σίμων ἐνθάδε ξενίζεταί, Heb. xi. 8; cf. Plat. apol. 21 b. ἡπόρουν, τί ποτε λέγει, Plutarch. Opp. II. 208 b., 220 f., 221 c., 230 f., 231 c. etc.; Polyb. 1, 60, 6; 4, 69, 3; Diog. L. 6, 42; 2, 69, and, in general, very frequently, not to say uniformly, in Greek authors.

b. With the *Subjunctive*, when something objectively possible, something which may or should take place, is to be expressed (Klotz,

¹ In Greek the Objective is expressed in the Objective mood; in Latin, the Objective, made to depend on the act of asking and inquiring, is for that reason put as a mere conception: *interrogo quid sit*. Cf. Jen. L. Z. 1812. no. 194.

Devar. 511); as, Matt. viii. 20 ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει, ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνει *where he may lay*, ubi reponat, Krü. 166; Rom. viii. 26 τί προσευξόμεθα καθὼ δέῃ, οὐκ οἶδαμεν *what we should pray for* (as to the var. προσευξόμεθα, see Fr. in loc.), Matt. vi. 25; x. 19; Mark xiii. 11; Luke xii. 5, 11; Heb. viii. 3; 1 Pet. v. 8; cf. Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 202 and rep. I. 72; Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 21; Cyr. 1, 4, 13; Anab. 1, 7, 7; 2, 4, 19; Isocr. paneg. c. 41; Plat. rep. 368 b. Likewise after a Pret., as in Acts iv. 21 μηδὲν εὐρύσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσονται αὐτοὺς, Luke xix. 48; xxii. 2; Mark iii. 6 συμβούλιον ἐποιοῦν . . . ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσι, xi. 18; xiv. 1, 40., where the Opt. might be used (Lucian. dial. d. 17, 1; 25, 1 etc., Kühner II. 103; Hm. Vig. 741), but the Subjunctive is used inasmuch as there is a reference to the direct question they put to each other: πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωμεν (deliberative Subjunct. cf. Thuc. 2, 52.).

In such cases the Fut. Ind. also may be used for the Subjunctive (owing to the affinity between these two forms¹); as, Phil. i. 22 τί αἰρήσομαι 281 (without var.), οὐ γνωρίζω *what I am to choose*, Mark ix. 6, see Demosth. 7th ed. funebr. 152 b.; Thuc. 7, 14; Herod. 5, 4, 16; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. 151. 315 On the other hand, there is the testimony of the most distinguished Codd. [Sin. also] for ἀρέσῃ in 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33, 34. But in Mark iii. 2 παρητήρουν αὐτόν, εἰ . . . θεραπεύσει means: *whether he will* (would) *heal*, and the Fut. is necessary, as in 1 Cor. vii. 16. See Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 249.

c. The *Optative* is used to denote subjective possibility — a mere conception; hence in narration after a Pret. if a person is introduced with a question referring simply to his idea alone; as Luke xxii. 23 ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν *who he might* 268 *be* i.e. whom they should regard as, i. 29 (2 Macc. iii. 37); iii. 15; 6th ed. viii. 9; xv. 26; xviii. 36; Acts xvii. 11 ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον . . . ἀνακρίνοντας τὰς γραφάς, εἰ ἔχοι ταῦτα οὕτως *whether these things were so*, xxv. 20; cf. Her. 1, 46; 3, 28, 64; Xen. A. 1, 8, 15; 2, 1, 15; C. 1, 4, 6, and Hm. as above, 742. See, further, Acts xvii. 27 ἐποίησε . . . πᾶν ἔθνος . . . ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, εἰ ἄραγε ψηλαφήσειαν *if haply they might feel after* etc., Acts xxvii. 12 (Thuc. ii. 77) see Mith. 1213; Klotz p. 509.

Acts xxi. 33 ἐπυνθάνετο, τίς ἂν εἴη καὶ τί ἐστι πεποιηκώς throws especial light on the distinctive import of the moods in dependent clauses after τίς etc. That the prisoner had committed some offence was certain, or was assumed by the centurion as certain, and τί ἐστι π. inquires after the

¹ Hm. Eurip. Io p. 155: ubique in conjunctivo inest futuri notatio, cujus ille cumque temporis sit. Cf. Bmñ. 106 f.

matter of fact of the πεποιθέναι; but *who* the prisoner might be was a point on which the centurion wished then for the first time to form an idea. Cf. Xen. Eph. 5, 12 ἐπεθαυμάκει, *τίνας τε ἦσαν καὶ τί βούλοιντο*, Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 107; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. 139. See also Dio Chr. 35, 429; 41, 499; Heliod. 1, 25, 46; 2, 15, 81.

In the phrase οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς or τίς ἐστιν ὃς (of similar import), even followed by the Fut., the Indicative is always and properly used; as, Matt. x. 26 οὐδέν ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται *there is nothing covered, which shall not be revealed* (though the Romans would have said: nihil est, quod non manifestum futurum sit), xxiv. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 5; Phil. ii. 20; Acts xix. 35; Heb. xii. 7 (Judith viii. 28; Tob. xiii. 2); cf. Vig. p. 196 sq.; Bhdy. 390. The Subjunctive occurs only once in connection with the Ind.: Luke viii. 17 οὐ γάρ ἐστι κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ (BL [Sin.] have ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ). See below, § 42, 3 b. The passage adduced by Lob. Phryn. 736 from Joseph. Antt. 13, 6 is also not fully established. As to the import of this Subjunctive, see below, § 42, 3 b, p. 307.

In Juo. vii. 35 the Fut. Indic. is quite according to rule: ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι (λέγων), ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐχ εὐρήσομεν αὐτόν; *whither will this man go, that* (according to his statement, vs. 34) *we shall not find him?* In οὐχ εὐρήσῃ the words uttered by him (vs. 34) are repeated in the tense and mood of direct discourse. Acts vii. 40 (a quotation from the O. T.) is also quite correct: ποίησον ἡμῖν θεούς, οἱ προπορεύονται ἡμῶν *qui antecedant* (see Mtth. 1145), Phil. ii. 20; 1 Cor. ii. 16; cf. Demosth. Polycl. 711 b.; Plat. Gorg. 513 etc.; Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 2; Aristot. Nic. 9, 11.

The use of the Indic. Fut. after εἰ or εἰ ἄρα, also, is worthy of notice in cases such as Acts viii. 22 δεήθητι τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεται σοι ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου, Mark xi. 13 ἦλθεν, εἰ ἄρα εὐρήσει τι ἐν αὐτῇ *he came, if haply he might find* etc. (in Latin, *si forte ... inveniret*). The words are here expressed in the mood which the speaker himself would employ: I will go and see, whether I shall find, etc. The Ind. Fut. after εἰπὼς Rom. i. 10 is of a different description, but equally well established.

In Eph. v. 15 if the sense had been: *take heed how you may (can) walk exactly* the Subjunctive or Fut. Indicative must have been employed. With the Indic. Pres. the question refers to the *manner* in which the ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖν, as a Christian duty, is carried into effect; see *how* you realize the ἀκριβ. περιπατ., how you set about living accurately. Cf. Fritzsche. Opusc. p. 209. 1 Cor. iii. 10 ἕκαστος βλεπῶ πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ is not exactly similar to the preceding, inasmuch as in this passage after ἄλλος ἐποικοδομεῖ there can be no doubt that reference is made to a matter of fact.

5. The Optative in the oratio obliqua (Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 18) but rarely appears: Acts xxv. 16 πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίθητι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαι τινα ἄνθρωπον, πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος

κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχου τοὺς κατηγοροὺς τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι etc.; and indeed the instances in which the words of another are indirectly quoted are rare in the N. T. When such instances occur the Indicative is commonly used; either because the intermediate clause where the Optative might have been expected is uttered in the person of the narrator (Bmln. 270) Luke viii. 47; Matt. xviii. 25; Mark ix. 9; Acts xxii. 24, or because by a mingling of two constructions the mood of the oratio recta is used for that of the oratio obliqua (which was perhaps in special accordance with colloquial usage); as, Acts xv. 5 ἐξανέστησαν τινες τῶν . . . Φαρισαίων, λέγοντες ὅτι δεῖ περιτέμνειν etc., Luke xviii. 9 εἶπε καὶ πρὸς τινὰς τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, ὅτι εἰσὶ δίκαιοι (on the contrary, Mtth. 1222), Acts xii. 18 ἦν ταραχος οὐκ ὀλίγη . . . τί ἄρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο, ix. 27; xxiii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 15. Something similar occurs in Attic authors (though for the most part in lengthened sentences) Isocr. Trapez. 860; Demosth. Phorm. 586 and Polycl. 710, 711; Lys. caed. Eratosth. 19; Xen. Cyrop. 2, 4, 3; 3, 2, 27; 4, 5, 36; Hell. 2, 1, 24, and later writers Aelian. 11, 9; Diog. L. 2, 32, 74; Pausan. 6, 9, 1. See Heindorf, Plat. Soph. 317 p. 439 sq.; Mtth. 1224 sq.; Bhdy. 389.

Note 1. The consecutive particle ὥστε is usually construed with the Infin. (as the simple Infin. may be employed in a consecutive sense), cf. § 44. Yet the Finite verb is used, not only where ὥστε begins a new clause (in the sense of *quare, itaque*),—sometimes in the Indic. as in 283 Matt. xii. 12; xix. 6; xxiii. 31; Rom. vii. 4; xiii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 27; xiv. 22; 2th ed. 2 Cor. iv. 12; v. 16; Gal. iii. 9; iv. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 18; 1 Pet. iv. 19, etc. (Gayler de partic. negat. p. 218 sq.), and sometimes in the Conjunct. exhort. as in 1 Cor. v. 8 and the Imperat. as in 1 Cor. iii. 21; x. 12; Phil. ii. 12; iv. 1; Jas. i. 19, etc. (Soph. El. 1163; Plutarch. Them. c. 27),—but also where the clause with ὥστε forms a necessary complement to the preceding clause, as in Jno. iii. 16 οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε . . . ἔδωκεν, Gal. ii. 13 (but in Acts xiv. 1 οὕτως ὥστε with Inf.). This construction is very common also in Greek authors. Thus ὥστε occurs with a Finite verb after οὕτω in Isocr. Areopag. p. 343, 354; de big. p. 838; Aegin. p. 922; Evag. 476; Lysias pro Mantith. 2, and pro mil. 17; Xen. C. 1, 4, 15; 2, 2, 10; Diog. L. 9, 68, after εἰς τοσοῦτον in Isocr. de big. p. 836; Soph. Oed. R. 533; see Gayler as above, 221 sq. Cf. Schaef. Plutarch. V. 248. The distinction at least in the better authors seems to be this: ὥστε with the Indic. presents the facts in succession purely externally as ante- 270 cedent and consequent; while with the Inf. it brings them into closer connection as issuing one from the other, Klotz 772; cf. Bmln. 88.

Note 2. Ὀφελον (ὠφελον) is in the N. T. (as in later Greek) treated

quite as a particle, and construed with the Indic.; a. Of the Preterite, 1 Cor. iv. 8 ὄφελον ἐβασιλεύσατε *would that ye did reign*, Imperf. 2 Cor. xi. 1 ὄφελον ἀνείχασθέ μου μικρόν *would that ye had patience with me for a little*; b. Of the Fut. Gal. v. 12. With this construction of ὄφελον cf. Arrian. Epictet. 2, 18, 15 ὄφελόν τις μετὰ ταύτης ἐκοιμήθη, Gregor. orat. 28 (Exod. xvi. 3; Num. xiv. 2; xx. 3). When ὄφελον had once come to be regarded as a particle, the former construction was just as correct in thought as the Imperf. or Aor. Indic. after εἴθε, Mtth. 1161; Klotz, Devar. 516 (aor. de re, de qua, quom non facta sit olim, nunc nobis gratum fore significamus, si facta esset illo tempore); the Fut., however, took the place of the Opt. In Rev. iii. 15 some Codd. have ὄφελον ψυχρὸς εἶης, others ἦς. Both readings make equally good sense.

318 § 42. THE CONJUNCTION 'AN WITH THE THREE MOODS.¹

1. The particle ἄν, which in general imparts to the expression the impress of being dependent on circumstances (a fortuita quadam conditione), and accordingly conditional and fortuitous (Hm. 284 Vig. 903, 820; de partic. ἄν p. 10 sq.), *forte*, si res ita ferat, *perhaps*,
 7th ed. *perchance* (should the case occur),² is used with one of the three moods either in an independent or a dependent clause. Yet its use in the N. T. (as in general in later Greek) is far less copious 271 and diversified than in classic (Attic) writers;³ in particular, it is
 6th ed. never found joined with a participle. In independent and simple clauses ἄν occurs in the N. T.,

¹ Compare, as to the use of this particle, the following monographs: *Poppo*, Pr. de usu partic. ἄν apud Graecos. Frcf. ad Viad. 1816. 4to. (also in *Seebode's* Miscell. crit. I. 1), *Reisig* de vi et usu ἄν particulae in his edit. of Aristoph. nub. (Lips. 1820. 8vo.) p. 97-140. I have mainly followed the theory of *Hermann*, from which the views of *Buttmann*, and still more those of *Thiersch* (Acta Monac. II. 101 sqq.), partly differ. It is most fully expounded in libb. 4 de particula ἄν, which are printed in the London edition of Stephanus's Thesaurus, as well as in *Hermann's* Opuscul. Tom. IV., and which were also published separately in Leipsic, 1831. 8vo. With *Hermann* on all the main points *Klotz* Devar. II. 99 agrees, while *Hartung* Partik. II. 218 ff. widely dissents from both. The opinion hitherto accepted respecting the import of ἄν has been completely reversed by *B. Matthiae* in his Lexic. Eurip. I. 189 sqq.; he pronounces it to be rather a corroborating and affirming particle, and gives us to understand that his view is a divina et qua nihil unquam verius exstitit descriptio. Further, compare *Bäumlein* on the Greek Moods (see above p. 281) and *Möller* in *Schneidewin*, Philolog. VI. 719 ff.

² Perhaps the *halt* of the South of Germany may also be compared with it.

³ In the Sept. ἄν does not occur more seldom than in the N. T. (*Bretschneid. Lexic.* p. 22 says: multo rarius). It occurs in hypothetical clauses, where it is *required*. It is also sometimes construed with the Optative, as in Gen. xix. 8; xxxiii. 10; xliv. 8, and with the Participle in 2 Macc. i. 11; 3 Macc. iv. 1. It occurs on almost every page. As to ἄν in the Apocrypha, see *Wahl*, Clav. apocr. p. 34 sqq.

a. With the Aorist Indic. to indicate that something on a certain condition *would have* taken place (in which use a hypothetical proposition is implied in the context) Mtth. 1154 f.; Rost 606 f.; as, Luke xix. 23 διὰ τί οὐκ ἔδωκας τὸ ἀργύριόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν; καὶ ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν ἔπραξα αὐτό, *I should* (had the διδόναι τὸ ἀργύρ. ἐπὶ τὴν τράπ. occurred) *have collected it with interest*. Here the omitted protasis may be easily gathered from the question διὰ τί . . . τράπεζαν. The same remark applies to the parallel passage in Matt. xxv. 27 ἔδει σε βαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριόν μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ, and Heb. x. 2 ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, where we may supply from vs. 1: if these sacrifices had perfected forever the offerers, — completely cleansed them from sin (Xen. A. 4, 2, 10; Thuc. 1, 11; 319 Plat. symp. 175 d.; rep. 8, 554 b.; Aristot. rhet. 2, 2, 11; Diog. L. 2, 75). Cf. Sept. Gen. xxvi. 10; Job iii. 10, 13 (Pluperf. 2 Sam. xviii. 11).

b. With the Optative, when subjective possibility is attached to condition (opinio de eo, quod ex aliqua conditione pendet, Hm. partic. ἂν 164 sqq.),¹ Acts xxvi. 29 εὐχαίμην ἂν τῷ θεῷ (I could willingly pray God, i.e. were I to be guided by what I feel — were I to follow the wish of my heart). This phrase (corresponding to βουλοίμην ἂν) occurs in Dio C. 36, 10, and εὐχαιτ' ἂν τις in Xen. hipparch. 8, 6, ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εὐχαίμην Diog. L. 2, 76. We find a similar phrase, ἀξιώσαιμ' ἂν, in Liban. oratt. p. 200 b. In direct questions: Acts ii. 12 λέγοντες τί ἂν θέλοι τοῦτο εἶναι; *what may this perhaps mean?* (I assume it must mean something), xvii. 18 285
τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; (it being assumed that 7th ed. his words have some meaning or other), Luke vi. 11; Gen. xxiii. 15; Deut. xxviii. 67; Job xix. 23; xxv. 4; xxix. 2; xxxi. 31; Eccles. xxv. 3. Cf. Od. 21, 259; Xen. C. 1, 4, 12; Diog. L. 2, 5; Krü. 163.

Acts viii. 31 is equivalent to a hypothetical construction: πῶς ἂν διναίμην, εἰ μὴ τις ὁδηγήσῃ με; for without a question it would run: οὐκ ἂν διναίμην, cf. Xen. Apol. 6 ἦν αἰσθάνωμαι χείρων γιγνόμενος . . . πῶς ἂν . . . ἐγὼ ἔτι ἂν ἡδέως βιοτεύοιμι;

We find ἂν (according to most Codd. [Sin. included]) without a mood (Hm. partic. ἂν, p. 187) in 1 Cor. vii. 5 μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, εἰ μὴ τι ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου, except perhaps in case of mutual consent.

2. After conditional clauses with εἰ we find ἂν in the apodosis

¹ Klotz p. 104: Adjecta ad optativum ista particula hoc dicitur: nos rem ita animo cogitare, si quando fiat, i.e. rem, si fiat, ita fieri oportere ex cogitatione quidem nostra. Cf. *Mds.* 148 f.

with the Indicative to denote hypothetical reality (Rost 627; Mth. 1147 f.), and then,

a. With the Imperf. (usually), when *I would do it* is to be expressed, *a*. After an Imperf. in the antecedent clause, as in Luke vii. 39 οὗτος εἰ ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκειν ἂν etc. *were he a prophet, he would know*, xvii. 6; Matt. xxiii. 30 (Fr.); Jno. v. 46; (viii. 19); 272 6th ed viii. 42; ix. 41; xv. 19; xviii. 36; Gal. i. 10; Heb. viii. 4, 7; 1 Cor. xi. 31; Acts xviii. 14; cf. 2 Macc. iv. 47; Valckenaer ad Luc. xvii. 6. β. After an Aor. in the antecedent clause, as in Heb. iv. 8 εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει *if J. had given them rest, he would not speak* etc. (in the words pre- 320 viously quoted vs. 5) cf. in vs. 7 the Pres. ὀρίζει; Gal. iii. 21 (cf. Jer. xxiii. 22; Baruch iii. 13).

b. With the Aor., when *I would have done it* is to be expressed (Hm. Vig. 813), Matt. xi. 21 εἰ ἐγένοντο . . . πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν *if . . . had been done, they would have repented long ago*, 1 Cor. ii. 8; Rom. ix. 29; Sept. Gen. xxx. 27; xxxi. 27, 42; xliii. 9; Judg. xiii. 23; xiv. 18; Isa. i. 9; xlviii. 18; Ps. l. 18; liv. 13; Judith xi. 2, etc. (in the conditional clause also the Aor. is used); Jno. xiv. 28 εἰ ἠγαπήτέ με, ἐχάρητε ἂν *if ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced*, xviii. 30; Acts xviii. 14 (the Imperf. in the conditional clause, Bar. iii. 13); Matt. xii. 7 εἰ ἐγνώκετε . . . οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε *had ye known, ye would not have condemned* (the Pluperf. in the conditional clause, cf. Demosth. Pantaen. p. 624 b.; Liban. oratt. p. 117 c.); Judg. viii. 19; Job iv. 12. In this case the Plup. also is used instead of the Aor. with ἂν, as in 1 Jno. ii. 19 εἰ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενῆκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν *mansissent* (atque adeo manerent), Jno. xi. 21 (vs. 32 Aor.) xiv. 7 (Soph. Oed. R. 984; Aeschin. Ctes. 310 a.; Demosth. cor. 324 a.; Plat. Phaed. 106 c.; Diog. L. 3, 39; Aesop. 31, 1; Lucian. fugit. 1; cf. Hm. partic. ἂν p. 50). See in general Hm. partic. ἂν I. cap. 10. The translators of the N. T. have sometimes been ignorant of this distinction of tenses, and sometimes have passed it over without notice. (The consequent clause with ἂν is absorbed by an interrogative clause in 286 1 Cor. xii. 19 εἰ ἦν τὰ πάντα ἐν μέλος, ποῦ τὸ σῶμα; Heb. vii. 11 εἰ 7th ed τελείωσις διὰ τῆς . . . ἱερωσύνης ἦν, τίς ἐτι χρεῖα etc. for οὐκέτι ἂν ἦν χρεῖα etc. As to ἂν in the interrogatory apodosis, see Wisd. xi. 26 πῶς ἔμεινεν ἂν τι, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἠθέλησας; On Acts viii. 31 see above.)

In Mark xiii. 20 εἰ μὴ κύριος ἐκολόβωσε . . . οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ neither of the Aorists is put for the Imperf., but the sense is: *had not the Lord shortened those days* (in his decree), *all flesh would have perished*.

(might be regarded as already perished). In Heb. xi. 15 εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευον... εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι the Imperf. is used in the principal clause probably because it refers to a *continued* (past) action (Mtth. 1147; Mdv. 117); in Latin also the Imperf. is used in the same way (Zumpt, Gramm. 454) *haberent: had they in mind... they had opportunity* (during their life) *to return* (and would not therefore, at the end of their life vs. 13, have made this profession). The Aor. would have represented the εἶχεν καιρὸν as something occurring once, and quickly passing by. Another view of the Imperf. in hypothetical clauses (Franke, Demosth. p. 59, 74) is not to the purpose.

In the consequent clause ἄν may be omitted also, particularly with the Imperf. (Hm. Eurip. Hec. 1087; Soph. Elect. p. 132, and 321 partic. ἄν p. 70 sqq.; Bremi, exc. 4 ad Lys. p. 439 sq.; Mtth. 1152), 273 and in later Greek was more and more frequently omitted, without ^{6th ed.} designing in all cases to express the emphasis (the positiveness) originally included in this construction without ἄν (Kühner II. 556).¹ The several examples may be arranged as follows:

a.) Imperf. in the condition, Imperf. in the conclusion; as, Jno. ix. 33 εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν *were he not from God, he could do nothing*, Diog. Laert. 2, 24; Lycurg. orat. 8, 4; Plat. sympos. 198 c.; Gorg. 514 c. In Jno. viii. 39 the Codd. are about equally divided as to the omission or insertion of ἄν; if it was used by the writer, it may have been merged by transcribers in the νῦν which immediately follows.

b.) Aorist in the conclusion, with the omission of ἦν in the condition; as, Gal. iv. 15 εἰ δυνατὸν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ μοι, where there is not much authority for ἄν.

c.) Aorist in the condition, Imperf. in the conclusion; as, Jno. xv. 22 εἰ μὴ ἦλθον... ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον *if I had not come, they would not have sin*, cf. Diog. Laert. 2, 21.

d.) Pluperf. in the conditional clause (Judg. viii. 19), Imperf. in the principal clause; as, Jno. xix. 11 οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν οὐδεμίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἂν ὡθεν θου *wouldst not have... if it had not been given thee*, Acts xxvi. 32; Rom. vii. 7 *non cognoram... nisi diceret*; also, in the immediately preceding τὴν ἁμαρτίαν etc., where ἔγνω is to be repeated with εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου.

This omission of ἄν occurs especially with καλὸν ἦν, ἔδει, ἐχρὴν 287 etc. Mdv. 119; Bmln. 140 f.; cf. Matt. xxvi. 24 καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ^{7th ed.} ἐγεννήθη etc., see above, § 41 a. 2. a, p. 282.

¹ Similar are such sentences in Latin as Flor. 4, 2, 19 *peractum erat bellum sine sanguine, si Pompeium opprimere* (Caesar) *potuisset*, Horat. Od. 2, 17, 27; Liv. 34, 29; Cic. fam. 12, 24, 2; Tac. annal. 3, 14; Sen. consol. ad Marc. I. See Zumpt, Gr. S. 447.

2 Cor. xi. 4 εἰ δὲ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει... καλῶς ἀνέχεσθαι is rendered: *if he ... preached, ye would bear with etc.* (Cod. B alone has ἀνέχεσθε, and it has been so printed by Lehm.). Here one would certainly expect ἐκήρυσσεν, but as several words intervene the writer might easily have fallen into such an anacoluthon (*if ... preaches another Jesus ... ye would bear with it ἀνείχ*, as if he had written ἐκήρυσσεν. As, however, he had used κηρύσσει, consistency required ἀνέχεσθε), or in order not to hurt the Corinthians he designedly changes the harsh ἀνέχεσθε into the hypothetical and consequently softer ἀνείχ; in which case, to be sure, one
 322 would so much the more have expected ἄν, as the antecedent clause does not correspond with a hypothetical period (cf. also Klotz, Devar. 487 sq.). We find something similar in Diog. L. 2, 69 εἰ τοῦτο φαῖλόν ἐστιν, οἷα ἂν ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἐορταῖς ἐγίνετο. The passage in Demosth. Neær. 815 a. is of another kind. (That in Rom. iv. 2 ἔχει καύχημα is not put for εἶχεν ἂν, as Rück. maintained, is apparent to one who attends to Paul's reasoning, and has been correctly shown by Köllner among recent expositors.)

274 3. In relative clauses after ὅς, ὅστις, ὅσος, ὅπου etc., ἂν is used,
 6th ed. a. With the *Indicative* when some matter of fact, something certain therefore, is spoken of, "sed cujus vel pars aliqua, vel ratio et modus dubitationem admittunt" (Hm. Vig. 819)¹; as, Mark vi. 56 ὅπου ἂν εἰσπορεύετο *wherever he entered*, ubicunque intrabat (it might be in different places and repeatedly), ὅσοι ἂν ἤπτοντο αὐτοῦ *as many as at any time touched him*; καθότι ἂν Acts ii. 45; iv. 35, ὥς ἂν 1 Cor. xii. 2. In all these instances with a Pret., as in Gen. ii. 19; xxx. 42; Isa. lv. 11; 2 Sam. xiv. 26; Ezek. i. 20; x. 11; Esth. viii. 17; 1 Macc. xiii. 20, and also in Greek authors, as Lucian. dial. m. 9, 2, and Demon. 10; Demosth. I. Steph. p. 610 b. (Agath. 32, 12; 117, 12; 287, 13; Malal. 14, 36). On the other hand, the Present Ind. (which Klotz p. 109 sqq., in opposition to Hm., declares to be inadmissible) in the N. T. in Luke viii. 18: x. 8; Jno. v. 19 has not any great external evidence in its favor. and in Mark xi. 24 the Ind. without ἂν is to be restored, from Codd. [Sin. also], as by Lehm. In the Sept. the Present often occurs, as in Ps. ci. 3; Prov. i. 22; Lev. xxv. 16.

In Matt. xiv. 36 we find ὅσοι ἤψαντο, ἐσώθησαν, instead of the parallel in Mark vi. 56 ὅσοι ἂν ἤπτοντο, ἐσώζοντο. Both constructions are proper, according as the writer regarded the fact as in every respect definite or not. The first must be rendered: *all who (as many as) touched him, of*

¹ Klotz p. 145: In his locis quum res ipsa, quae facta esse dicatur, certa sit, pertinet illud, quod habet in se particula ἂν incerti, magis ad notionem relativam, sive pronomen, sive particula est.

the persons then surrounding him, vs. 35. Mark does not limit the nar- 288
ration to any particular place (as ὅπου ἂν εἰσπορεύετο shows), but says ^{7th ed.}
generally: *all who at any time touched him*. Cf. Hm. de part. ἂν p. 26.

b. With the *Subjunctive*, when the statement relates to some-
thing objectively possible, that is, regarded as only conditionally
liable to occur, and then *α*. In the Aorist (most frequently), of
what may perhaps occur at a future time, — where in Latin the
Fut. Perf. would be used; as, Matt. x. 11 εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην 323
εἰσέλθῃτε *into whatever city ye may have entered*, in quaecunque
urbem, si quam in urbem, xxi. 22 ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃτε *quaecunque*
petieritis, xii. 32; Mark ix. 18; xiv. 9; Luke x. 35; Acts ii. 39;
iii. 22, 23; viii. 19; Rom. x. 13; xvi. 2; Jas. iv. 4; 1 Jno. iv. 15;
Rev. xiii. 15, etc. For examples from Greek authors, see Bornem.
ad Luc. p. 65. From the Sept. cf. Gen. xxi. 6, 12; xxii. 2; xxiv. 14;
xxvi. 2; xxviii. 15; xliv. 9 f.; Exod. i. 22; ix. 19; x. 28; Lev.
v. 3, 15, 17; xi. 32; xx. 6, 9, 16 ff.; Num. v. 10; vi. 2; Deut.
xvii. 9; Isa. xi. 11. The Fut. for the Subjunctive occurs in Deut.
v. 27; Jer. xlix. 4; Judg. x. 18; xi. 24 (Malch. hist. p. 238; Cinnam.
I. 6, ed. Bonn.); Mtth. 1220. β. In the Present, in reference
to what may have already taken place or usually takes place, or
is to be represented as continuous; as, Gal. v. 17 ἵνα μὴ, ἀ ἂν
θέλῃτε, *ταῦτα ποιῇτε* (what you may happen to desire), Col. iii. 17
πάν ὅ,τι ἂν ποιῇτε, 1 Thess. ii. 7 ὡς ἂν τροφὸς θάλπη etc., Luke
ix. 57; Jno. ii. 5; v. 19; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Jas. iii. 4; Col. iii. 23. 275
See, in general, Hm. part. ἂν p. 113 sqq.; Vig. 819. In the Sept. ^{6th ed.}
cf. Gen. vi. 17; xi. 6; 1 Sam. xiv. 7; Lev. xv. 19; Exod. xxii. 9;
(much more rare than the Aor.).

In 2 Cor. viii. 12 a double construction occurs: εἰ ἡ προθυμία πρόκειται,
καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχη, εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει. The distinction is obvious:
the positive ἔχειν in the proportion specified (καθὸ) may still be viewed as
various, *according to what he may (perchance) have*; the negative οὐκ ἔχει
is simple and definite. Cf. Lev. xxiv. 20; xxv. 16; xxvii. 12; xi. 34
πάν βρώμα, ὃ ἔσθεται, εἰς ὃ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὕδωρ.

In Attic prose ἂν is commonly employed where relatives are construed
with the Subjunctive; yet there are well-established passages in which ἂν
is omitted (Rost 660 f.), and Hm. partic. ἂν p. 113 has shown when it
must be omitted; cf. Schaef. Demosth. I 657; Poppo, observ. p. 143 sqq.;
Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1816, April, no. 69, and ad Cyrop. p. 129, 209, but see Bmln.
212 ff. In the N. T. we find according to good Codd. [Sin. also] in Luke
viii. 17 οὐ γάρ ἐστι . . . ἀπόκρυφον, ὃ οὐ γνωστὴ (al. γνωστήσεται) καὶ εἰς
φανερὸν ἐλθῇ, which is to be rendered: which *may* not become known
and come to light. The relative here points to a perfectly definite con-

ception, and not to anything whatever, quodcunque. On the other hand, one might have expected ἄν in Jas. ii. 10 ὅστις ὄλον τὸν νόμον τηρήσῃ, πταισῇ 289 δὲ ἐν ἐνί, yet it is not necessary, inasmuch as the writer conceives the case 7th ed. as altogether definite: qui (si quis) . . . custodiverit. So also in Matt. x. 33. On the other hand, in Matt. xviii. 4 Lchm. has already adopted the Fut.

4. In indirect questions ἄν is used with the Optative (after a Pret. 324 or histor. Pres.); as, Luke i. 62 ἐνένευον τῷ πατρί, τὸ τι ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτόν *how he may perhaps wish him to be called* (assumed that he has a wish in the case; τί θέλοι etc. would be, *how he would wish him to be called*), Acts v. 24; x. 17; xxi. 33 (see above § 41, b. 5), Luke vi. 11 διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τί ἂν ποιήσαιαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ *what they might do to Jesus*, quid forte faciendum videretur (pondering in doubtful mood the different possibilities), ix. 46; Jno. xiii. 24 according to the reading νεύει τούτῳ Σίμων Π. πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει (*who it might be*, whom they should perhaps regard). The better reading, however, is νεύει . . . καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ τίς ἐστὶν περὶ οὗ λέγει. See Klotz p. 509; cf. Esth. iii. 13.

5. After the particles of time ἄν followed by a Subjunctive (Mtth. 1194 f.) is used if an (objectively possible) action is to be expressed, — a case which can or will occur, but in regard to which there is no certainty when (how often) it will occur (Hm. partic. ἄν p. 95 sqq.).

Thus, a. ὅταν i.e. ὅτ' ἂν, Matt. xv. 2 νύπτονται τὰς χεῖρας, ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσι *when* (i.e. as often as) *they eat*, Jno. viii. 44; 1 Cor. iii. 4; Luke xi. 36; xvii. 10 ὅταν ποιήσητε πάντα, λέγετε *when ye shall have done*, Matt. xxi. 40 ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος . . . τί ποιήσει 276 *quando venerit*. So usually with the Aorist Subjunctive for the 6th ed. Lat. Fut. exact., as in Mark viii. 38; Jno. iv. 25; xvi. 13; Rom. xi. 27; Acts xxiii. 35; 1 Cor. xv. 27; xvi. 3; 1 Jno. ii. 28, also Heb. i. 6 (as Böhme and Wahl have already pointed out), while the Subj. Present for the most part denotes a frequently repeated action not limited to any particular time (Mtth. 1195), or exhibits something in itself future simply as a fact, 1 Cor. xv. 24 (along with the Subj. Aor.). Similar to this are ἡνίκα ἂν 2 Cor. iii. 16 (*when . . . it shall have turned*), ὅσάκις ἂν (*as often as*) 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26 (Pres.), ὡς ἂν *as soon as* Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xi. 34; Phil. ii. 23.

b. The conjunction *until that*, as ἕως ἂν¹ in Matt. x. 11 ἐκεῖ μένετε, ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε, Jas. v. 7; Luke ix. 27, ἄχρις οὗ ἂν in Rev. ii. 25 (Gen. xxiv. 14, 19; Josh. ii. 16; xx. 6, 9; Exod. xv. 16; Isa. vi. 11; xxvi. 20; xxx. 17; Tob. vii. 11, and often); cf. Soph.

¹ We find in parallel clauses in Exod. xv. 16; Jer. xxiii. 20 ἕως with the Subj. and ἕως ἂν, according to the common text.

Oed. R. 834; Xen. C. 3, 3, 18 and 46; An. 5, 1, 11; Plat. Phaed. 59 e. etc., and usually in Attic prose, Rost 617. Further cf. § 41 b. 3, 2) b). Πρὶν ἄν does not occur in the N. T.

The Fut. after ὅταν in Rev. 4, 9 ὅταν δώσουσι τὰ ζῶα δόξαν ... πεσοῦνται οἱ εἰκοσι τέσσαρες etc., occurs according to a well-established reading for the Subjunctive *quando dederint*, as in Iliad. 20, 335 ἀλλ' ἀναχωρῆσαι, ὅτε 325 κεν ξυμβλήσεται αὐτῷ. Other Codd. have δώσι or δώσωσι. In Luke xi. 2; 290 xiii. 28; Matt. x. 19 there is preponderant authority for the Subjunctive. 7th ed. In Rom. ii. 14 the Ind. Pres. ποιεῖ after ὅταν is very doubtful (or rather a transcriber's mistake for ποιῇ), and we should read with Lchm. and Tdf. ποιῶσιν. On the other hand, in Mark xi. 25 στήκετε is supported by good Codd., and the Ind. can be as well tolerated (since it is intended to express a specification of time only externally: *cum statis precantes*) according to Klotz, Devar. 475 sq., as it is attested by Codd. in Lycurg. 28, 3.¹ In this case the Ind. Pres. or Fut. after ὅταν sometimes occurs even in early authors, see Klotz as above, and pp. 477 sq. 690,² where formerly critics would not tolerate it (Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 61; Achill. Tat. 452; Mtth. 1197); in later authors (cf. e.g. Exod. i. 16; Act. Apocr. 126) it frequently occurs (Jacobs in Act. Monac. I. 146; Schaef. ind. Aesop. 149).

More singular appears, in Mark iii. 11, ὅταν with an Indicative Preter. (Imperf.) in narration: τὰ πνεύματα ... ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρει, προσέπιπτεν whenever they saw him (quandocunque), without var.; in Rev. viii. 1 with var. A Greek would probably have here employed (ὅτε, ὁπότεν with) the Optative, Hm. Vig. 792;³ yet in the former passage the Ind. can be accounted for as easily as in ὅσοι ἄν ἤπτοντο, see above, 3 a. Cf. Gen. xxxviii. 9; Exod. xvii. 11; Num. xi. 9; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; Ps. cxix. 7; Thiersch p. 100 (and ἡνίκα ἄν Gen. xxx. 42; Exod. xxxiii. 8; xxxiv. 34; 277 xl. 36, ὁπότε ἰάν Tob. vii. 11, ἰάν Judg. vi. 3, where likewise a repeated 6th ed. past act is expressed), also Polyb. 4, 32, 5; 13, 7, 10 (see Schweigh. on the last passage); Aristid. Lept. § 3, 6; cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 313.⁴ In the Byzantine authors, ὅταν even in the sense of *when* (in reference to an individual fact in time past) is construed with the Ind. Aor., as in Ephraem. 7119, 5386, 5732; Theoph. p. 499, 503. Cf. also Tdf. in the Verhand. p. 142.

6. The particle of design ὅπως with ἄν denotes a purpose the accomplishment of which is still doubtful, or is regarded as depending on circumstances, *ut sit, si sit* (see Hm. Eurip. Bacch. 593, 1232;

¹ Bekker has conjectured ὅσι. Others read ὅτ' ἐν, and Blume says distinctly: indicativus per grammaticas leges h. l. ferri nequit.

² The passages adduced by Gayler de partic. negat. p. 193 sq. may be regarded for the most part as uncertain.

³ Fr. Mr. p. 801 insists on writing ὅτ' ἄν, in order to show that ἄν here belongs to the verb in the sense of *always*. Cf. Schaef. Demosth. III. 192. Yet see Klotz, Dev. 688 sq.

⁴ In the Sept. even ὡς ἄν occurs with the Ind. Pret. where a definite past action is spoken of, as in Gen. vi. 4; xxvii. 30 ὡς ἄν ἐξῆλθεν Ἰακώβ, etc.

partic. *ἄν* p. 120 sq.) *ut, si fieri possit, ut forte* (cf. Bengel, Acts iii. 19; Rom. iii. 4) Isocr. ep. 8, p. 1016; Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 21; Plat. Gorg. 481 a.; conv. 187 e.; legg. 5, 738 d. etc; Demosth. Halon. 32 c.; see Stallb. ad Plat. Lach. p. 24; Krü. 167. This applies well to the two N. T. passages which come under this head (Acts xv. 17; Rom. iii. 4 are quotations from the O. T.; and in Matt. vi. 5 *ἄν* is expunged on the authority of many Codd.) : Acts iii. 19 *ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως ut forte* (si meae admonitioni μετανοήσατε καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε parueritis) *veniant tempora* etc., Luke ii. 35. In both the quotations from the Sept. too, particularly in Acts xv., the meaning is plain. Besides cf. Gen. xii. 13; xviii. 19; I. 20; Exod. xx. 20, 26; xxxiii. 13; Num. xv. 40; xvi. 40; xxvii. 20; Deut. viii. 2; xvii. 20; 2 Sam. xvii. 14; Ps. lix. 7; Hos. ii. 3; Jer. xlii. 7; Dan. ii. 18; 1 Macc. x. 32.

**Ἄν* after conjunctions and relatives never occurs with the Optative in the N. T. (but in Sept. Gen. xix. 8 — cf., however, xvi. 6 — xxxiii. 10; 2 Macc. xv. 21); but once with the Inf. 2 Cor. x. 9 *ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς that I may not seem to terrify you*; which in oratio recta (Hm. de partic. *ἄν* p. 179; Krü. 311) would run: *ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβοῖμι ὑμ. tamquam qui velim vos terrere.*

According to the best and most numerous authorities *ἔάν* frequently occurs for *ἄν* in the N. T. text after relatives (as in the Sept. and Apocryph. see Wahl, clav. apocryph. p. 137 sq.; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 8, occasionally in the Byzantines, e.g. Malalas 5. p. 94, 144); as, Matt. v. 19 (not vii. 9); viii. 19; x. 42; xi. 27; Jno. xv. 7; Luke xvii. 33; 1 Cor. vi. 18; xvi. 3; Gal. vi. 7; Eph. vi. 8, etc., and not unfrequently in the Codd. of Greek authors, even Attic. Recent scholars (in opposition to Schneider, Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 12) uniformly write *ἄν* for *ἔάν* (see Schaef. Julian. p. V; Hm. Vig. 835; Bremi, Lys. p. 126; Boissonade, Aen. Gaz. p. 269; Stallb. Plat. Lach. p. 57; a more moderate judgment is given by Jacobs, Athen. p. 88; yet see the same author in Lection. Stob. p. 45 and on Achill. Tat. p. 831 sq., cf. also Valckenaer ad 1 Cor. vi. 18). The editors of the N. T. have not yet ventured to do this; and there may really be in *ἔάν* for *ἄν* a peculiarity of the later (if not even of the earlier) popular language much like the Germ. *etwan* in relative clauses: *was etwan geschehen sollte* (when something occurs as it should be). Cf. Luke x. 8.

§ 43. THE IMPERATIVE.

1. The Imperative usually denotes an exhortation or command, but sometimes mere permission (permissivus) or leave (Krü.

163) ¹, as in 1 Cor. vii. 15 *εἰ ὁ ἄπιστος χωρίζεται, χωρίζεσθω* *he may* 327 *depart* (on the part of the Christian partner it cannot and ought not to be hindered), xiv. 38 *εἰ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοεῖτω* (renunciation of further effective instruction). Where, however, *this* acceptance 292 is necessary, must be determined on hermeneutical, not on gram-^{7d} *al* matical, grounds; and neither in Matt. viii. 32, on account of the parallel passage Luke viii. 32, nor in Jno. xiii. 27 or 1 Cor. xi. 6, can the Imperative be taken as simply permissive. On the former passage cf. BCrus.; in the latter *κειράσθω* like *κατακαλυπτέσθω* is to be understood of logical necessity (the one requires the other). On the other hand, Matt. xxvi. 45 *καθεύδετε τὰ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε* was probably uttered permissively by Jesus in the tranquil, gentle, resigned mood resulting from the prayer: *sleep on then and take your rest*. The notion of irony is incompatible with the grave earnestness of the moment. Perhaps, however, there may be something of that in Matt. xxiii. 32, and the tone of the discourse loses in force by a permissive interpretation. In Rev. xxii. 11 all is exhortation: let every one by adhering to his present course grow ripe for Christ's approaching judgment; the fate of all is, as it were, already determined.

2. When two Imperatives are connected by *καὶ*, the first contains sometimes the condition (supposition) under which the action denoted by the second will take place, or the second expresses an infallible result (Mtth. 1159) ²; as, Bar. ii. 21 *κλίνετε τὸν ὄμῳν ὑμῶν ἐργάσασθαι τῷ βασιλεῖ . . . καὶ καθίσαιτε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*, Eriphan. II. 368 *ἔχε τοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγους κατὰ ψυχὴν σου καὶ χρεῖαν μὴ ἔχε Ἐπιφανίου*. In the N. T. this explanation has been applied to Eph. iv. 26. (from Ps. iv. 5.) *ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε* *be angry and* 279 *sin not* i.e. if ye be angry ye do not sin (Rü.), Jno. vii. 52 *ἐρευνήσου* ^{7d} *al* *καὶ ἴδε* *search, and thou wilt see* (Kü.); cf. *divide et impera*. In Hebrew, constructions of this sort are certainly frequent; Ewald,

¹ According to Moller (Schneidewin, Philolog. VI. 124 ff.) the Imper. Pres. only should be so used. This, it is true, is found in the above passages of the N. T.; but the question in reference to the N. T. will not be regarded as thereby decided.

² What Bornem. on Luke xxiv. 39 adduces from Greek authors, is of a different nature. This mode of expression, however, cannot be considered as thereby a Hebraism; see Gesen. Lgb. S. 776 (where, however, some passages are quoted which remain doubtful, as Ps. xxxvii. 27, or which at any rate ought to have been separated from the others Gen. xlii. 18; Isa. viii. 9). With Eph. iv. 26 (p. 312) those passages have no analogy, otherwise the words of Paul must mean: if ye are angry, yet do not sin, or even: if ye would not sin, then be angry. It is therefore surprising that, notwithstanding this, Zyro (Stud. u. Krit. 1841. 3 Heft S. 685) has had recourse again to this alleged Hebraism.

krit. Gramm. 653. But in Jno. vii. the expression is more forcible than *καὶ ὄψει* (Lucian. indoct. 29) would have been. The result of the search is so certain, that the exhortation to search is at the same time an exhortation to see. We find the regular construction
 328 in Luke x. 28. In the passage from Eph. Paul's meaning is unquestionably this: we should not let anger lead us into sin, cf. vs. 27 (see Bengel and BCrus. in loc.); vs. 31 cannot be urged against this. It is only the grammatical acceptance of the expression that is doubtful. It is either logically a single proposition *ὀργιζόμενοι μὴ ἁμαρτ.* divided into two grammatically, or *ὀργίζεσθε* must be taken permissively (cf. the similar passage Jer. x. 24). For, the assertion (Mey.) that of two closely connected Imperatives the
 293 one cannot denote a permission and the other a command, is incorrect; we may say with perfect propriety: Well, then, go (I give
 7th ed. you leave), but do not stay out above an hour.

1 Tim. vi. 12 *ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως, ἐπιαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς* (where the asyndeton is not without special force) must be rendered simply: *fight the good fight of faith, lay hold of* (in and by that fight) *eternal life*; cf. Mark iv. 39, see Fr. *Ἐπιαμβ. τῆς ζωῆς* is not here exhibited (though it might have been) as the result, but as the very essence, of the contest; and *ἐπιαμβ.* does not signify *attain, receive*. In 1 Cor. xv. 34 *ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε* are obviously two exhortations, one of which (Aor.) is to be carried into effect at once, while the other (Pres.) requires continuous effort.

Constructions like Jno. ii. 19 *λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν*, Jas. iv. 7 *ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύζεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν* (vs. 8), Eph. v. 14 (Sept.) *ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός*, may be resolved like two Imperatives connected by *καί*: *if ye resist the devil, he will, etc.* But this, grammatically, requires no remark, as the Imperative has here its ordinary import (hortatory), and the structure of these sentences can, indeed must (as incomparably more forceful), be retained in the translation also. Cf. Lucian. indoct. 29 *τοὺς κουρέας τούτους ἐπίσκεψαι καὶ ὄψει*, dial. d. 2, 2 *εὐρυθμα βαῖνε καὶ ὄψει*, Plato, Theaet. 149 b.; rep. 5, 467 c.; see Fr. Mt. as above. Even recent expositors quite erroneously take the Imperative in Jno. ii. 19; xx. 22 for the Fut., supporting their view by a reference to the Heb. in such passages as Gen. xx. 7; xlv. 18 (Glass. Philol. sacr. I. 286). Inasmuch as every command extends into future time, the Fut. tense, as a general expression of futurity, may be used for the Imperative (see no. 5); but the special form (the Imperative) cannot, in turn, be employed for the more general (Fut.). Such
 280 a substitution would occasion a confusion of tongues, and the observation
 6th ed. above alluded to, like so many others, is the offspring of the closet, not of attention to the phenomena of living speech. Olshausen has correctly

opposed Tholuck (and Kühnöl) on Jno. xx. 22, and Tholuck has rectified 329 his error. In Luke xxi. 19 the Fut. is the better reading; see Meyer.

3. In the N. T. the distinction between the Aorist Imperative and Present Imperative is in general maintained (Hm. emend. rat. p. 219 and Vig. 748, cf. H. Schmid de imperativi temporib. in ling. graec. Viteb. 1833, 4to. and especially Bmln. 169 ff., and in reference to the latter, Moller in Schneidewin Philologus VI. 115 ff.). For

a. The Aorist Imperat. (cf. § 40 note 2.) denotes an action that is either transient and instantaneous (Ast, Plat. polit. p. 518; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 488), or to be undertaken but once; as, Mark i. 44 *σεαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ*, iii. 5 *ἐκτείνουν τὴν χεῖρά σου*, vi. 11 *ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν*, Jno. ii. 7 *γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος* etc., xi. 44 *λύσατε αὐτὸν* (Λάζαρ.) κ. *ἄφετε αὐτὸν ὑπάγειν*, 1 Cor. v. 13 *ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*, Acts xxiii. 23 *ἐτοιμάσατε στρατώτας διακο-* ^{7th ed.} *σίους forthwith make ready to march*. Besides these, see Mark ix. 22, 43; x. 21; xiii. 28; xiv. 15, 44; xv. 30; Luke xx. 24; Jno. ii. 8; iv. 35; vi. 10; xi. 39; xiii. 29; xviii. 11; xxi. 6; Acts iii. 4; vii. 33; ix. 11; xvi. 9; xxi. 39; xxii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Eph. vi. 13, 17; Col. iii. 5; Tit. iii. 13; Philem. 17; Jas. iii. 13; iv. 8, 9; 1 Pet. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 5, 10. When something to be carried into effect at once is expressed, sometimes *νῦν* or *νυνὶ* is added to the Aorist Imperat.; as, Acts x. 5; xxiii. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 11. The Aorist Imperat. is used also when *δή* strengthens the injunction, as in Acts xiii. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 20 (Judith v. 3; vii. 9; Bar. iii. 4; Xen. C. 1, 3, 9; Soph. El. 524; Klotz; Devar. 395).

b. The Present Imperat. denotes an action already begun and to be continued (Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 742), or one that is permanent and frequently recurring. Hence it is commonly employed in the measured and dispassionate language of laws and moral precepts, e.g. Rom. xi. 20 *μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει* (as thou now art), xii. 20 *ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν* (constantly in such case), xiii. 3 *θέλεις μὴ φοβέσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποίει*, Jas. ii. 12 *οὕτω λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτω ποιεῖτε, ὡς διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας* etc., 1 Tim. iv. 7 *τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γραῶδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ*, cf. Jas. iv. 11; v. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 11, 13; v. 7, 19; vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 8, 14; Tit. i. 13; iii. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 24; x. 14, 25; xvi. 13; Phil. ii. 12; iv. 3, 9; Eph. ii. 11; iv. 25, 26, 28; vi. 4; Jno. i. 44; xxi. 16; Mark viii. 15; ix. 7, 39; xiii. 11; xiv. 38. Hence in ordinary discourse the Present Imperat. conveys more softness and reserve of expression, and frequently denotes merely advice (Moller as above, 123 f.). 330

Accordingly the Present and the Aorist Imperat. are sometimes

with the Indicative to denote hypothetical reality (Rost 627; Mtth. 1147 f.), and then,

a. With the Imperf. (usually), when *I would do it* is to be expressed, *a*. After an Imperf. in the antecedent clause, as in Luke vii. 39 οὗτος εἰ ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν etc. *were he a prophet, he would know*, xvii. 6; Matt. xxiii. 30 (Fr.); Jno. v. 46; (viii. 19); 272 6th ed viii. 42; ix. 41; xv. 19; xviii. 36; Gal. i. 10; Heb. viii. 4, 7; 1 Cor. xi. 31; Acts xviii. 14; cf. 2 Macc. iv. 47; Valckenaer ad Luc. xvii. 6. *β*. After an Aor. in the antecedent clause, as in Heb. iv. 8 εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει ἰφ *J. had given them rest, he would not speak* etc. (in the words pre- 320 viously quoted vs. 5) cf. in vs. 7 the Pres. ὀρίζει; Gal. iii. 21 (cf. Jer. xxiii. 22; Baruch iii. 13).

b. With the Aor., when *I would have done it* is to be expressed (Hm. Vig. 813), Matt. xi. 21 εἰ ἐγένοντο . . . πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν *if . . . had been done, they would have repented long ago*, 1 Cor. ii. 8; Rom. ix. 29; Sept. Gen. xxx. 27; xxxi. 27, 42; xliii. 9; Judg. xiii. 23; xiv. 18; Isa. i. 9; xlviii. 18; Ps. l. 18; liv. 13; Judith xi. 2, etc. (in the conditional clause also the Aor. is used); Jno. xiv. 28 εἰ ἠγαπήσασθε με, ἐχάρητε ἂν *if ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced*, xviii. 30; Acts xviii. 14 (the Imperf. in the conditional clause, Bar. iii. 13); Matt. xii. 7 εἰ ἐγνώκετε . . . οὐκ ἂν καταδικάσατε *had ye known, ye would not have condemned* (the Pluperf. in the conditional clause, cf. Demosth. Pantæn. p. 624 b.; Liban. oratt. p. 117 c.); Judg. viii. 19; Job iv. 12. In this case the Plup. also is used instead of the Aor. with ἂν, as in 1 Jno. ii. 19 εἰ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενῆκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν *manerent* (atque adeo manerent), Jno. xi. 21 (vs. 32 Aor.) xiv. 7 (Soph. Oed. R. 984; Aeschin. Ctes. 310 a.; Demosth. cor. 324 a.; Plat. Phaed. 106 c.; Diog. L. 3, 39; Aesop. 31, 1; Lucian. fugit. 1; cf. Hm. partic. ἂν p. 50). See in general Hm. partic. ἂν I. cap. 10. The translators of the N. T. have sometimes been ignorant of this distinction of tenses, and sometimes have passed it over without notice. (The consequent clause with ἂν is absorbed by an interrogative clause in 286 1 Cor. xii. 19 εἰ ἦν τὰ πάντα ἐν μέλος, πού τὸ σῶμα; Heb. vii. 11 εἰ 7th ed τελείωσις διὰ τῆς . . . ἱερωσύνης ἦν, τίς ἔτι χρεία etc. for οὐκέτι ἂν ἦν χρεία etc. As to ἂν in the interrogatory apodosis, see Wisd. xi. 26 πῶς ἔμεινεν ἂν τι, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἠθέλησας; On Acts xviii. 31 see above.)

In Mark xiii. 20 εἰ μὴ κύριος ἐκόλοβωσε . . . οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ *neither of the Aorists is put for the Imperf., but the sense is: had not the Lord shortened those days* (in his decree), *all flesh would have perished*.

(might be regarded as already perished). In Heb. xi. 15 *εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευον... εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι* the Imperf. is used in the principal clause probably because it refers to a *continued* (past) action (Mtth. 1147; Mdv. 117); in Latin also the Imperf. is used in the same way (Zumpt, Gramm. 454) *haberent: had they in mind... they had opportunity* (during their life) *to return* (and would not therefore, at the end of their life vs. 13, have made this profession). The Aor. would have represented the *ἔχειν καιρὸν* as something occurring once, and quickly passing by. Another view of the Imperf. in hypothetical clauses (Franke, Demosth. p. 59, 74) is not to the purpose.

In the consequent clause *ἂν* may be omitted also, particularly with the Imperf. (Hm. Eurip. Hec. 1087; Soph. Elect. p. 132, and 321 partic. *ἂν* p. 70 sqq.; Bremi, exc. 4 ad Lys. p. 439 sq.; Mtth. 1152), 273 and in later Greek was more and more frequently omitted, without ^{6th ed.} designing in all cases to express the emphasis (the positiveness) originally included in this construction without *ἂν* (Kühner II. 556).¹ The several examples may be arranged as follows:

a.) Imperf. in the condition, Imperf. in the conclusion; as, Jno. ix. 33 *εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν* *were he not from God, he could do nothing*, Diog. Laert. 2, 24; Lycurg. orat. 8, 4; Plat. sympos. 198 c.; Gorg. 514 c. In Jno. viii. 39 the Codd. are about equally divided as to the omission or insertion of *ἂν*; if it was used by the writer, it may have been merged by transcribers in the *νῦν* which immediately follows.

b.) Aorist in the conclusion, with the omission of *ἦν* in the condition; as, Gal. iv. 15 *εἰ δυνατόν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ μοι*, where there is not much authority for *ἂν*.

c.) Aorist in the condition, Imperf. in the conclusion; as, Jno. xv. 22 *εἰ μὴ ἦλθον... ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον* *if I had not come, they would not have sin*, cf. Diog. Laert. 2, 21.

d.) Pluperf. in the conditional clause (Judg. viii. 19), Imperf. in the principal clause; as, Jno. xix. 11 *οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν οὐδεμίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἀνωθεν* *thou wouldst not have... if it had not been given thee*, Acts xxvi. 32; Rom. vii. 7 *non cognoram... nisi diceret*; also, in the immediately preceding *τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* etc., where *ἔγνω* is to be repeated with *εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμον*.

This omission of *ἂν* occurs especially with *καλὸν ἦν*, *ἔδει*, *ἔχρην* 287 etc. Mdv. 119; Bmlu. 140 f.; cf. Matt. xxvi. 24 *καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ* ^{7th ed.} *ἔγεννηθῃ* etc., see above, § 41 a. 2. a, p. 282.

¹ Similar are such sentences in Latin as Flor. 4, 2, 19 *peractum erat bellum sine sanguine, si Pompeium opprimere* (Caesar) *potuisset*, Horat. Od. 2, 17, 27; Liv. 34, 29; Cic. fam. 12, 24, 2; Tac. annal. 3, 14; Sen. consol. ad Marc. I. See Zumpt, Gr. S. 447.

2 Cor. xi. 4 εἰ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει ... καλῶς ἀνέχεσθε is rendered: *if he ... preached, ye would bear with etc.* (Cod. B alone has ἀνέχεσθε, and it has been so printed by Lchm.). Here one would certainly expect ἐκήρυσεν, but as several words intervene the writer might easily have fallen into such an anacoluthon (*if ... preaches another Jesus ... ye would bear with it ἀνείχ.*, as if he had written ἐκήρυσεν. As, however, he had used κηρύσσει, consistency required ἀνέχεσθε), or in order not to hurt the Corinthians he designedly changes the harsh ἀνέχεσθε into the hypothetical and consequently softer ἀνείχ.; in which case, to be sure, one
 322 would so much the more have expected *άν*, as the antecedent clause does not correspond with a hypothetical period (cf. also Klotz, Devar. 487 sq.). We find something similar in Diog. L. 2, 69 εἰ τοῦτο φαῖλόν ἐστιν, οἷς *άν* ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἑορταῖς ἐγίνετο. The passage in Demosth. Neer. 815 a. is of another kind. (That in Rom. iv. 2 ἔχει καύχημα is not put for εἶχεν *άν*, as Rück. maintained, is apparent to one who attends to Paul's reasoning, and has been correctly shown by Köllner among recent expositors.)

274 3. In relative clauses after *ὅς, ὅστις, ὅσος, ὅπου* etc., *άν* is used,
 6th ed. a. With the *Indicative* when some matter of fact, something certain therefore, is spoken of, "*sed cujus vel pars aliqua, vel ratio et modus dubitationem admittunt*" (Hm. Vig. 819)¹; as, Mark vi. 56 *ὅπου άν* εἰσπορεύετο *wherever he entered*, ubicunque intrabat (it might be in different places and repeatedly), *ὅσοι άν* ἤπτοντο αὐτοῦ *as many as at any time touched him*; καθότι *άν* Acts ii. 45; iv. 35, ὡς *άν* 1 Cor. xii. 2. In all these instances with a Pret., as in Gen. ii. 19; xxx. 42; Isa. lv. 11; 2 Sam. xiv. 26; Ezek. i. 20; x. 11; Esth. viii. 17; 1 Macc. xiii. 20, and also in Greek authors, as Lucian. dial. m. 9, 2, and Demon. 10; Demosth. I. Steph. p. 610 b. (Agath. 32, 12; 117, 12; 287, 13; Malal. 14, 36). On the other hand, the Present Ind. (which Klotz p. 109 sqq., in opposition to Hm., declares to be inadmissible) in the N. T. in Luke viii. 18: x. 8; Jno. v. 19 has not any great external evidence in its favor. and in Mark xi. 24 the Ind. without *άν* is to be restored, from Codd. [Sin. also], as by Lchm. In the Sept. the Present often occurs, as in Ps. ci. 3; Prov. i. 22; Lev. xxv. 16.

In Matt. xiv. 36 we find *ὅσοι ψάωτο, ἐσώθησαν*, instead of the parallel in Mark vi. 56 *ὅσοι άν* ἤπτοντο, ἐσώζοντο. Both constructions are proper, according as the writer regarded the fact as in every respect definite or not. The first must be rendered: *all who* (as many as) *touched him, of*

¹ Klotz p. 145: In his locis quum res ipsa, quae facta esse dicatur, certa sit, pertinet illud, quod habet in se particula *άν* incerti, magis ad notionem relativam, sive pronomina, sive particula est.

the persons then surrounding him, vs. 35. Mark does not limit the narration to any particular place (as *ὅπου ἂν εἰσπορεύετο* shows), but says generally: *all who at any time touched him*. Cf. Hm. de part. ἂν p. 26.

b. With the *Subjunctive*, when the statement relates to something objectively possible, that is, regarded as only conditionally liable to occur, and then *a*. In the Aorist (most frequently), of what may perhaps occur at a future time, — where in Latin the Fut. Perf. would be used; as, Matt. x. 11 εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθῃτε *into whatever city ye may have entered*, in quaecunque urbem, si quam in urbem, xxi. 22 ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃτε *quaecunque petieritis*, xii. 32; Mark ix. 18; xiv. 9; Luke x. 35; Acts ii. 39; iii. 22, 23; viii. 19; Rom. x. 13; xvi. 2; Jas. iv. 4; 1 Jno. iv. 15; Rev. xiii. 15, etc. For examples from Greek authors, see Bornem. ad Luc. p. 65. From the Sept. cf. Gen. xxi. 6, 12; xxii. 2; xxiv. 14; xxvi. 2; xxviii. 15; xlv. 9 f.; Exod. i. 22; ix. 19; x. 28; Lev. v. 3, 15, 17; xi. 32; xx. 6, 9, 16 ff.; Num. v. 10; vi. 2; Deut. xvii. 9; Isa. xi. 11. The Fut. for the Subjunctive occurs in Deut. v. 27; Jer. xlix. 4; Judg. x. 18; xi. 24 (Malch. hist. p. 238; Cinnam. I. 6, ed. Bonn.); Mtth. 1220. β. In the Present, in reference to what may have already taken place or usually takes place, or is to be represented as continuous; as, Gal. v. 17 ἵνα μὴ, ἂν θέλῃτε, ταῦτα ποιῇτε (what you may happen to desire), Col. iii. 17 πᾶν ὅ,τι ἂν ποιῇτε, 1 Thess. ii. 7 ὡς ἂν τροφὸς θάληη etc., Luke ix. 57; Jno. ii. 5; v. 19; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Jas. iii. 4; Col. iii. 23. See, in general, Hm. part. ἂν p. 113 sqq.; Vig. 819. In the Sept. cf. Gen. vi. 17; xi. 6; 1 Sam. xiv. 7; Lev. xv. 19; Exod. xxii. 9; (much more rare than the Aor.).

In 2 Cor. viii. 12 a double construction occurs: εἰ ἡ προθυμία πρόκειται, καθὼς ἂν ἔχῃ, εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὼς οὐκ ἔχει. The distinction is obvious: the positive ἔχειν in the proportion specified (καθὼς) may still be viewed as various, *according to what he may (perchance) have*; the negative οὐκ ἔχει is simple and definite. Cf. Lev. xxiv. 20; xxv. 16; xxvii. 12; xi. 34 πᾶν βρῶμα, ὃ ἔσθεται, εἰς ὃ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὕδωρ.

In Attic prose ἂν is commonly employed where relatives are construed with the Subjunctive; yet there are well-established passages in which ἂν is omitted (Rost 660 f.), and Hm. partic. ἂν p. 113 has shown when it must be omitted; cf. Schaef. Demosth. I 657; Poppo, observ. p. 143 sqq.; Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1816, April, no. 69, and ad Cyrop. p. 129, 209, but see Bmln. 212 ff. In the N. T. we find according to good Codd. [Sin. also] in Luke viii. 17 οὐ γάρ ἐστι . . . ἀπόκρυφον, ὃ οὐ γνωστὸν (al. γνωσθήσεται) καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἐλθῇ, which is to be rendered: which *may* not become known and come to light. The relative here points to a perfectly definite con-

ception, and not to anything whatever, quodcunque. On the other hand, one might have expected ἄν in Jas. ii. 10 ὅστις ὄλον τὸν νόμον τηρήσῃ, πταιίσῃ 289 δὲ ἐν ἐνί, yet it is not necessary, inasmuch as the writer conceives the case 7th ed. as altogether definite: qui (si quis) . . . custodiverit. So also in Matt. x. 33. On the other hand, in Matt. xviii. 4 Lchm. has already adopted the Fut.

4. In indirect questions ἄν is used with the Optative (after a Pret. 824 or histor. Pres.); as, Luke i. 62 ἐνένευον τῷ πατρί, τὸ τι ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτόν *how he may perhaps wish him to be called* (assumed that he has a wish in the case; τί θέλοι etc. would be, *how he would wish him to be called*), Acts v. 24; x. 17; xxi. 33 (see above § 41, b. 5), Luke vi. 11 διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τί ἂν ποιήσαιαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ *what they might do to Jesus*, quid forte faciendum videretur (pondering in doubtful mood the different possibilities), ix. 46; Jno. xiii. 24 according to the reading νεύει τούτῳ Σίμων Π. πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει (*who it might be*, whom they should perhaps regard). The better reading, however, is νεύει . . . καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ τίς ἐστὶν περὶ οὗ λέγει. See Klotz p. 509; cf. Esth. iii. 13.

5. After the particles of time ἄν followed by a Subjunctive (Mtth. 1194 f.) is used if an (objectively possible) action is to be expressed, — a case which can or will occur, but in regard to which there is no certainty when (how often) it will occur (Hm. partic. ἄν p. 95 sqq.).

Thus, a. ὅταν i.e. ὅτ' ἄν, Matt. xv. 2 νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας, ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσι *when* (i.e. as often as) *they eat*, Jno. viii. 44; 1 Cor. iii. 4; Luke xi. 36; xvii. 10 ὅταν ποιήσητε πάντα, λέγετε *when ye shall have done*, Matt. xxi. 40 ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος . . . τί ποιήσει 276 *quando venerit*. So usually with the Aorist Subjunctive for the 6th ed. Lat. Fut. exact., as in Mark viii. 38; Jno. iv. 25; xvi. 13; Rom. xi. 27; Acts xxiii. 35; 1 Cor. xv. 27; xvi. 3; 1 Jno. ii. 28, also Heb. i. 6 (as Böhme and Wahl have already pointed out), while the Subj. Present for the most part denotes a frequently repeated action not limited to any particular time (Mtth. 1195), or exhibits something in itself future simply as a fact, 1 Cor. xv. 24 (along with the Subj. Aor.). Similar to this are ἡνίκα ἄν 2 Cor. iii. 16 (*when . . . it shall have turned*), ὡς ἄν (*as often as*) 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26 (Pres.), ὡς ἄν *as soon as* Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xi. 34; Phil. ii. 23.

b. The conjunction *until that*, as ἕως ἄν¹ in Matt. x. 11 ἐκεῖ μένετε, ἕως ἄν ἐξέλθῃτε, Jas. v. 7; Luke ix. 27, ἄχρις οὗ ἄν in Rev. ii. 25 (Gen. xxiv. 14, 19; Josh. ii. 16; xx. 6, 9; Exod. xv. 16; Isa. vi. 11; xxvi. 20; xxx. 17; Tob. vii. 11, and often); cf. Soph.

¹ We find in parallel clauses in Exod. xv. 16; Jer. xxiii. 20 ἕως with the Subj. and ἕως ἄν, according to the common text.

Oed. R. 834; Xen. C. 3, 3, 18 and 46; An. 5, 1, 11; Plat. Phaed. 59 e. etc., and usually in Attic prose, Rost 617. Further cf. § 41 b. 3, 2) b). *Πρὶν ἄν* does not occur in the N. T.

The Fut. after *ὅταν* in Rev. 4, 9 *ὅταν δώσουσι τὰ ζωὰ δόξαν . . . πεσοῦνται οἱ εἰκοσι τέσσαρες* etc., occurs according to a well-established reading for the Subjunctive *quando dederint*, as in Iliad. 20, 335 *ἀλλ' ἀναχωρήσαι, ὅτε κεν ξυμβλήσεται αὐτῷ*. Other Codd. have *δώσι* or *δώσωσι*. In Luke xi. 2; 290 xiii. 28; Matt. x. 19 there is preponderant authority for the Subjunctive. In Rom. ii. 14 the Ind. Pres. *ποιεῖ* after *ὅταν* is very doubtful (or rather a transcriber's mistake for *ποιῇ*), and we should read with Lchm. and Tdf. *ποιῶν*. On the other hand, in Mark xi. 25 *στήκετε* is supported by good Codd., and the Ind. can be as well tolerated (since it is intended to express a specification of time only externally: *cum stasis precantes*) according to Klotz, Devar. 475 sq., as it is attested by Codd. in Lycurg. 28, 3.¹ In this case the Ind. Pres. or Fut. after *ὅταν* sometimes occurs even in early authors, see Klotz as above, and pp. 477 sq. 690,³ where formerly critics would not tolerate it (Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 61; Achill. Tat. 452; Mth. 1197); in later authors (cf. e.g. Exod. i. 16; Act. Apocr. 126) it frequently occurs (Jacobs in Act. Monac. I. 146; Schaef. ind. Aesop. 149).

More singular appears, in Mark iii. 11, *ὅταν* with an Indicative Preter. (Imperf.) in narration: *τὰ πνεύματα . . . ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρει, προσέπιπεν* *whenever they saw him* (quandocunque), without var.; in Rev. viii. 1 with var. A Greek would probably have here employed (*ὅτε, ὁπότεν* with) the Optative, Hm. Vig. 792;³ yet in the former passage the Ind. can be accounted for as easily as in *ὅσοι ἄν ἤπτοντο*, see above, 3 a. Cf. Gen. xxxviii. 9; Exod. xvii. 11; Num. xi. 9; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; Ps. cxix. 7; Thiersch p. 100 (and *ἡνίκα ἄν* Gen. xxx. 42; Exod. xxxiii. 8; xxxiv. 34; 277 xl. 36, *ὁπότε ἴάν* Tob. vii. 11, *ἴάν* Judg. vi. 3, where likewise a repeated 6th ed. past act is expressed), also Polyb. 4, 32, 5; 13, 7, 10 (see Schweigh. on the last passage); Aristid. Lept. § 3, 6; cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 313.⁴ In the Byzantine authors, *ὅταν* even in the sense of *when* (in reference to an individual fact in time past) is construed with the Ind. Aor., as in Ephraem. 7119, 5386, 5732; Theoph. p. 499, 503. Cf. also Tdf. in the *Verhandel.* p. 142.

6. The particle of design *ὅπως* with *ἄν* denotes a purpose the accomplishment of which is still doubtful, or is regarded as depending on circumstances, *ut sit, si sit* (see Hm. Eurip. Bacch. 593, 1232;

¹ Bekker has conjectured *δοσι*. Others read *δρ' ἐν*, and Blume says distinctly: *indicativus per grammaticas leges h. l. ferri nequit*.

² The passages adduced by Gayler de partic. negat. p. 193 sq. may be regarded for the most part as uncertain.

³ Fr. Mr. p. 801 insists on writing *δρ' ἄν*, in order to show that *ἄν* here belongs to the verb in the sense of *always*. Cf. Schaef. Demosth. III. 192. Yet see Klotz, Dev. 688 sq.

⁴ In the Sept. even *ὅς ἄν* occurs with the Ind. Pret. where a definite past action is spoken of, as in Gen. vi. 4; xxvii. 30 *ὅς ἄν ἐξῆλθεν Ἰακώβ*, etc.

partic. *ἄν* p. 120 sq.) *ut, si fieri possit, ut forte* (cf. Bengel, Acts iii. 19; Rom. iii. 4) Isocr. ep. 8, p. 1016; Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 21; Plat. Gorg. 481 a.; conv. 187 e.; legg. 5, 738 d. etc; Demosth. Halon. 32 c.; see Stallb. ad Plat. Lach. p. 24; Krü. 167. This applies well to the two N. T. passages which come under this head (Acts xv. 17; Rom. iii. 4 are quotations from the O. T.; and in Matt. vi. 5 *ἄν* is expunged on the authority of many Codd.): Acts iii. 19 *ὅπως ἄν ἔλθωσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως ut forte* (si meae admonitioni μετανοήσατε καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε parueritis) *veniant tempora* etc., Luke ii. 35. In both the quotations from the Sept. too, particularly in Acts xv., the meaning is plain. Besides cf. Gen. xii. 13; xviii. 19; l. 20; Exod. xx. 20, 26; xxxiii. 13; Num. xv. 40; xvi. 40; xxvii. 20; Deut. viii. 2; xvii. 20; 2 Sam. xvii. 14; Ps. lix. 7; Hos. ii. 3; Jer. xlii. 7; Dan. ii. 18; 1 Macc. x. 32.

Ἄν after conjunctions and relatives never occurs with the Optative in the N. T. (but in Sept. Gen. xix. 8 — cf., however, xvi. 6 — xxxiii. 10; 2 Macc. xv. 21); but once with the Inf. 2 Cor. x. 9 *ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς that I may not seem to terrify you*; which in oratio recta (Hm. de partic. *ἄν* p. 179; Krü. 311) would run: *ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβοῦμι ὑμᾶς tamquam qui velim vos terrere.*

According to the best and most numerous authorities *ἐάν* frequently occurs for *ἄν* in the N. T. text after relatives (as in the Sept. and Apocryph. see Wahl, clav. apocryph. p. 137 sq.; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 8, occasionally in the Byzantines, e.g. Malalas 5. p. 94, 144); as, Matt. v. 19 (not vii. 9); viii. 19; x. 42; xi. 27; Jno. xv. 7; Luke xvii. 33; 1 Cor. vi. 18; xvi. 3; Gal. vi. 7; Eph. vi. 8, etc., and not unfrequently in the Codd. of Greek authors, even Attic. Recent scholars (in opposition to Schneider, Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 12) uniformly write *ἄν* for *ἐάν* (see Schaef. Julian. p. V; Hm. Vig. 835; Bremi, Lys. p. 126; Boissonade, Aen. Gaz. p. 269; Stallb. Plat. Lach. p. 57; a more moderate judgment is given by Jacobs, Athen. p. 88; yet see the same author in Lection. Stob. p. 45 and on Achill. Tat. p. 831 sq., cf. also Valckenaer ad 1 Cor. vi. 18). The editors of the N. T. have not yet ventured to do this; and there may really be in *ἐάν* for *ἄν* a peculiarity of the later (if not even of the earlier) popular language much like the Germ. *etwan* in relative clauses: *was etwan geschehen sollte* (when something occurs as it should be). Cf. Luke x. 8.

§ 43. THE IMPERATIVE.

1. The Imperative usually denotes an exhortation or command, but sometimes mere permission (permissivus) or leave (Krü.

163)¹, as in 1 Cor. vii. 15 *εἰ ὁ ἄπιστος χωρίζεται, χωριζέσθω* *he may* 327 *depart* (on the part of the Christian partner it cannot and ought not to be hindered), xiv. 38 *εἴ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοεῖτω* (renunciation of further effective instruction). Where, however, *this* acceptance 292 is necessary, must be determined on hermeneutical, not on gram-^{7th ed.}matical, grounds; and neither in Matt. viii. 32, on account of the parallel passage Luke viii. 32, nor in Jno. xiii. 27 or 1 Cor. xi. 6, can the Imperative be taken as simply permissive. On the former passage cf. BCrus.; in the latter *κειράσθω* like *κατακαλυπτέσθω* is to be understood of logical necessity (the one requires the other). On the other hand, Matt. xxvi. 45 *καθεύδετε τὰ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε* was probably uttered permissively by Jesus in the tranquil, gentle, resigned mood resulting from the prayer: *sleep on then and take your rest*. The notion of irony is incompatible with the grave earnestness of the moment. Perhaps, however, there may be something of that in Matt. xxiii. 32, and the tone of the discourse loses in force by a permissive interpretation. In Rev. xxii. 11 all is exhortation: let every one by adhering to his present course grow ripe for Christ's approaching judgment; the fate of all is, as it were, already determined.

2. When two Imperatives are connected by *καὶ*, the first contains sometimes the condition (supposition) under which the action denoted by the second will take place, or the second expresses an infallible result (Mtth. 1159)²; as, Bar. ii. 21 *κλίνετε τὸν ὄμων ὑμῶν ἐργάσασθαι τῷ βασιλεῖ . . . καὶ καθίστατε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*, Epiphan. II. 368 *ἔχε τοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγους κατὰ ψυχὴν σου καὶ χρεῖαν μὴ ἔχε Ἐπιφανίου*. In the N. T. this explanation has been applied to Eph. iv. 26. (from Ps. iv. 5.) *ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε* *be angry and* 279 *sin not* i.e. if ye be angry ye do not sin (Rü.), Jno. vii. 52 *ἐρευνήσον* ^{7th ed.} *καὶ ἴδε* *search, and thou wilt see* (Kü.), cf. *divide et impera*. In Hebrew, constructions of this sort are certainly frequent; Ewald,

¹ According to Moller (Schneidewin, Philolog. VI. 124 ff.) the Imper. *Pres.* only should be so used. This, it is true, is found in the above passages of the N. T.; but the question in reference to the N. T. will not be regarded as thereby decided.

² What Bornem. on Luke xxiv. 39 adduces from Greek authors, is of a different nature. This mode of expression, however, cannot be considered as thereby a Hebraism; see Gesen. Lgb. S. 776 (where, however, some passages are quoted which remain doubtful, as Ps. xxxvii. 27, or which at any rate ought to have been separated from the others Gen. xlii. 18; Isa. viii. 9). With Eph. iv. 26 (p. 312) those passages have no analogy, otherwise the words of Paul must mean: if ye are angry, yet do not sin, or even: if ye would not sin, then be angry. It is therefore surprising that, notwithstanding this, Zyro (Stud. u. Krit. 1841. 3 Heft S. 685) has had recourse again to this alleged Hebraism.

krit. Gramm. 653. But in Jno. vii. the expression is more forcible than *καὶ ὄψει* (Lucian. indoct. 29) would have been. The result of the search is so certain, that the exhortation to search is at the same time an exhortation to see. We find the regular construction
 328 in Luke x. 28. In the passage from Eph. Paul's meaning is unquestionably this: we should not let anger lead us into sin, cf. vs. 27 (see Bengel and BCrus. in loc.); vs. 31 cannot be urged against this. It is only the grammatical acceptance of the expression that is doubtful. It is either logically a single proposition *ὀργιζόμενοι μὴ ἁμαρτ.* divided into two grammatically, or *ὀργιζέσθε* must be taken permissively (cf. the similar passage Jer. x. 24). For, the assertion (Mey.) that of two closely connected Imperatives the
 293 one cannot denote a permission and the other a command, is incorrect; we may say with perfect propriety: Well, then, go (I give
 7th ed. you leave), but do not stay out above an hour.

1 Tim. vi. 12 ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως, ἐπὶ λαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς (where the asyndeton is not without special force) must be rendered simply: *fight the good fight of faith, lay hold of* (in and by that fight) *eternal life*; cf. Mark iv. 39, see Fr. Ἐπιλαμβ. τῆς ζωῆς is not here exhibited (though it might have been) as the result, but as the very essence, of the contest; and ἐπιλαμβ. does not signify *attain, receive*. In 1 Cor. xv. 34 ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε are obviously two exhortations, one of which (Aor.) is to be carried into effect at once, while the other (Pres.) requires continuous effort.

Constructions like Jno. ii. 19 λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν, Jas. iv. 7 ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεῖξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν (vs. 8), Eph. v. 14 (Sept.) ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφανῆσει σοὶ ὁ Χριστός, may be resolved like two Imperatives connected by καί: *if ye resist the devil, he will, etc.* But this, grammatically, requires no remark, as the Imperative has here its ordinary import (hortatory), and the structure of these sentences can, indeed must (as incomparably more forceful), be retained in the translation also. Cf. Lucian. indoct. 29 τοὺς κουρέας τούτους ἐπίσκεψαι καὶ ὄψει, dial. d. 2, 2 εὐρυθμα βαίνει καὶ ὄψει, Plato, Theaet. 149 b.; rep. 5, 467 c.; see Fr. Mt. as above. Even recent expositors quite erroneously take the Imperative in Jno. ii. 19; xx. 22 for the Fut., supporting their view by a reference to the Heb. in such passages as Gen. xx. 7; xlv. 18 (Glass. Philol. sacr. I. 286). Inasmuch as every command extends into future time, the Fut. tense, as a general expression of futurity, may be used for the Imperative (see no. 5); but the special form (the Imperative) cannot, in turn, be employed for the more general (Fut.). Such
 280 a substitution would occasion a confusion of tongues, and the observation
 6th ed. above alluded to, like so many others, is the offspring of the closet, not of attention to the phenomena of living speech. Olshausen has correctly

opposed Tholuck (and Kühnöl) on Jno. xx. 22, and Tholuck has rectified 329 his error. In Luke xxi. 19 the Fut. is the better reading; see Meyer.

3. In the N. T. the distinction between the Aorist Imperative and Present Imperative is in general maintained (Hm. emend. rat. p. 219 and Vig. 748, cf. H. Schmid de imperativi temporib. in ling. græc. Viteb. 1833, 4to. and especially Bmln. 169 ff., and in reference to the latter, Moller in Schneidewin Philologus VI. 115 ff.). For

a. The Aorist Imperat. (cf. § 40 note 2.) denotes an action that is either transient and instantaneous (Ast, Plat. polit. p. 518; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 488), or to be undertaken but once; as, Mark i. 44 *σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ*, iii. 5 *ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου*, vi. 11 *ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν*, Jno. ii. 7 *γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος* etc., xi. 44 *λύσατε αὐτὸν* (Λάζαρ.) κ. *ἄφετε αὐτὸν ὑπάγειν*, 1 Cor. v. 13 *ἐξάρατε τὸν 294 πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*, Acts xxiii. 23 *ἐτοιμάσατε στρατιώτας διακο- 7th ed. σίους forthwith make ready to march*. Besides these, see Mark ix. 22, 43; x. 21; xiii. 28; xiv. 15, 44; xv. 30; Luke xx. 24; Jno. ii. 8; iv. 35; vi. 10; xi. 39; xiii. 29; xviii. 11; xxi. 6; Acts iii. 4; vii. 33; ix. 11; xvi. 9; xxi. 39; xxii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Eph. vi. 13, 17; Col. iii. 5; Tit. iii. 13; Philem. 17; Jas. iii. 13; iv. 8, 9; 1 Pet. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 5, 10. When something to be carried into effect at once is expressed, sometimes *νῦν* or *νυνὶ* is added to the Aorist Imperat.; as, Acts x. 5; xxiii. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 11. The Aorist Imperat. is used also when *δή* strengthens the injunction, as in Acts xiii. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 20 (Judith v. 3; vii. 9; Bar. iii. 4; Xen. C. 1, 3, 9; Soph. El. 524; Klotz; Devar. 395).

b. The Present Imperat. denotes an action already begun and to be continued (Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 742), or one that is permanent and frequently recurring. Hence it is commonly employed in the measured and dispassionate language of laws and moral precepts, e.g. Rom. xi. 20 *μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει* (as thou now art), xii. 20 *ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν* (constantly in such case), xiii. 3 *θέλεις μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποίει*, Jas. ii. 12 *οὕτω λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτω ποιεῖτε, ὥς διὰ νόμον ἐλευθερίας* etc., 1 Tim. iv. 7 *τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γραῶδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ*, cf. Jas. iv. 11; v. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 11, 13; v. 7, 19; vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 8, 14; Tit. i. 13; iii. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 24; x. 14, 25; xvi. 13; Phil. ii. 12; iv. 3, 9; Eph. ii. 11; iv. 25, 26, 28; vi. 4; Jno. i. 44; xxi. 16; Mark viii. 15; ix. 7, 39; xiii. 11; xiv. 38. Hence in ordinary discourse the Present Imperat. conveys more softness and reserve of expression, and frequently denotes merely advice (Moller as above, 123 f.). 330

Accordingly the Present and the Aorist Imperat. are sometimes

used together, to denote respectively the distinctions above specified; as, Jno. ii. 16 ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεύθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου, 1 Cor. xv. 34 ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ μαρτάνετε, Acts xii. 8 περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου κ.
 281 ἀκολούθει μου, Rom. vi. 13 μὴδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν
 6th ed. ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, Mark ii. 9; Jno. v. 8, 11; ii. 8; cf. Plato, rep. 9, 572 d. θὲς τοίνυν πάλιν . . . νέον υἱὸν ἐν τοῖς τούτου αὐτῷ ἡθεσι τεθραμμένον. Τίθειμι. Τίθει τοίνυν καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκεῖνα περὶ αὐτὸν γιγνόμενα (Mith. 1128), Xen. C. 4, 5, 41; Demosth. Aphob. 2, p. 557 c. and 588 a.; Eurip. Hippol. 475 sq. and Heracl. 635.

4. Occasionally this distinction may seem to be disregarded (1 Pet. ii. 17), and the Aorist Imp. in particular appear to be employed where the Present Imp. would have been strictly required (Bhdy. 393). It must be remembered, however, that in many cases it depends on the writer whether or not he will represent the action as occurring in a point of time and momentary, or as only commencing, or likewise continuing. Neither must it be overlooked that the Aorist Imp. is in general more forcible and stringent than the Present Imp. (see no. 3), and the strengthening of discourse
 295 is mainly a subjective matter; cf. Schoem. ad Isaemum p. 235.¹
 7th ed. In accordance with these principles we must judge of the following passages: μέινετε ἐν ἐμοί Jno. xv. 4 etc. (also μένετε Luke ix. 4; 1 Jno. ii. 28, μένε 2 Tim. iii. 14, μενέτω 1 Cor. vii. 24 etc.), 1 Jno. v. 21 φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων (similarly 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 14., on the other hand 2 Pet. iii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 15), Heb. iii. 1 κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, Mark xvi. 15 πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Jno. xiv. 15 τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσατε, Jas. v. 7 μακροθυμήσατε ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου, cf. Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Tim. i. 8; ii. 3; iv. 2; 1 Pet. i. 13; ii. 2; v. 2. The Aorist Imp. will be found quite suitable in all these passages. In Rom. xv. 11 (Sept.) Jno. vii. 24 the Present Imp. and the Aorist Imp. even of the same verb are thus connected together. In many passages
 331 the reading varies e.g. Acts xvi. 15; Rom. xvi. 17; as also in the Codd. of Greek authors these two forms are often interchanged,

¹ In opposition to *Schaefer*. Demosth. III. 185 he remarks: tenuissimum discrimen esse apparet, ut saepenumero pro lubitu aut affectu loquentis variari oratio possit. Nam quid mirum, qui modo lenius iusserat: σκοπεῖτε (Demosth. Lept. 483), eundem statim cum majore quadam vi et quasi intentius flagitantem addere: λογίσασθε. Et plerumque, si non semper, apud pedestres quidem scriptores, in tali diversorum temporum conjunctione praes. imperativus antecedit, sequitur aoristus.

Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 99, 222, especially where they differ only in a single letter. Sometimes also one of these two Imperatives has become obsolete, — thus λάβε is constantly employed, not λάμβανε; or one of the forms predominates, as in the N. T. φέρε over ἐνεγκε. See Bmln. 172.

Respecting the Imperat. (Pres.) after μή, see § 56, 1, p. 501 sq.

The Perf. Imp. is used when an action, complete in itself, is represented as to continue in its effects, as in Mark iv. 39 in Christ's address to the troubled sea: *πεφύμωσο δε* (and remain) *still!* Cf. also ἔρρωσο, ἔρρωσθε 282 Acts xxiii. 30; xv. 29. See Hm. emend. rat. p. 218; Mtth. 1126 f.; 6th ed. Bmln. 174. Cf. Xen. M. 4, 2, 19; Thuc. 1, 71; Plato, Euthyd. 278 d. and rep. 8, 553 a.

5. The Imperative may also be superseded by other forms of expression:

a. By the phrase—originally elliptical—(my command is, or see) *that thou do not tarry*. We find ὅπως ἐπέξει τῷ μιαιφῶ Dem. Mid. 414 c. (ὅπως with Fut. Indic. Mdv. 126), Eurip. Cycl. 595; Aristoph. nub. 823, (less frequently with the Subjunctive, Xen. C. 1, 3, 18; Lucian. dial. d. 20, 2). In the N. T. (the weakened § 44,8) ἵνα is thus used with the Subjunctive in Mark v. 23 ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ, also in 2 Cor. viii. 7 (but not in 1 Cor. v. 2; 1 Tim. i. 3); and in the 3d Pers. in Eph. v. 33 ἡ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα (an Imperative precedes). In the Greek poets, however, ἵνα occurs in the same connection (Soph. Oed. C. 155), and also in later prose; as, Epict. 23 ἂν πτωχὸν ὑποκρίνεσθαι σε 296 θέλῃ (ὁ διδάσκαλος), ἵνα καὶ τοῦτον εὐφυνῶς ὑποκρίνη, Arrian. Epict. 7th ed. 4, 1, 41; and in the Byzantines even with the Ind. Pres., Malal. 13 p. 334, 16 p. 404. In Latin cf. Cic. fam. 14, 20: ibi ut sint omnia parata.

b. By a negative question with the Future (Hm. Vig. 740; Rost 678): *wilt thou not come immediately?* Aristoph. nub. 1296 οὐκ ἀποδιώξεις σεαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας; Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 22. Cf. Acts xiii. 10 οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου; 4 Macc. v. 10 οὐκ ἐξυπνώσεις; This construction, however, is for the most part more forcible than the Imperative.

c. In categorical sentences by the Future (especially in the negative form): *thou shalt not touch it*, Matt. vi. 5 οὐκ ἔσῃ ὡς ὑποκριταί, v. 48 (Lev. xi. 44). In Greek authors this mode of expression passes as milder than the Imperative, Mtth. 1122; Bhdy. 378; Sintenis, Plut. Themist. 175 sqq.; Stallb. Plato, rep. II. 295; Weber, Demosth. p. 369 sq.; (as to the Latin, see Ramsh. S. 421). 332

But in Hebrew it has established itself in the emphatic diction of legislation (Ewald, krit. Gr. 531); hence in quotations from the Old T.: Matt. v. 21, 27, 33 οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, Luke iv. 12; Acts xxiii. 5; Rom. vii. 7; xiii. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 9 (Heb. xii. 20 Sept.). Only the fifth commandment τίμα τὸν πατέρα etc. (from Sept.) Matt. xv. 4; xix. 19; Eph. vi. 2, etc. is expressed in the Imperat. In Rom. vi. 14 the Fut. expresses simple expectation. This form of expression may be in itself either stern or mild;—depending on the tone with which it is uttered.

d. By the Infinitive: *to proceed!* This, not to mention antique and epic diction, occurs in Greek prose, and not only when a command is uttered with excitement or imperious brevity (Hm. Soph. Oed. R. 1057; Schaef. Demosth. III. 530; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 146; Bhdy. 538),¹ but also in requests, wishes, and prayers (Bremi, Dem. 230; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 388; Fr. Rom. III. 86; Mdv. 155. Compare the ancient form of salutation χαίρειν Acts xv. 23; Jas. 283 i. 1). Expositors have often been over-ready to discover this usage 60 et. in the N. T. (Georgi, Hierocr. I. I. 58); altogether incorrectly in 1 Thess. iii. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 17; iii. 5, where as the accent shows Imperatives occur. In other passages the change of construction, in sentences of some length, has been overlooked: in Luke ix. 3 we find μήτε ῥύβδον . . . ἔχειν, as if μηδὲν αἶρειν had been employed in the preceding part of the sentence; both constructions might have followed εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, and the writer certainly thought of ἔχειν as an Infinitive depending on εἶπεν. In the parallel passage Mark vi. 8 f. we find another change of structure. Cf. Arrian. Al. 4, 20, 5 σὺ νῦν φύλαξον τὴν ἀρχήν· εἰ δὲ . . . σὺ δὲ . . . παραδοῦναι. Similarly Rom. xii. 15, see § 63. In other passages also the regular grammatical connection has been misunderstood: in Rev. x. 9 δοῦναι undoubtedly must be joined with λέγων; in Col. iv. 6 εἰδέναι 297 is an Inf. elucidating the preceding predicates of λόγος. Only in 11 et. Phil. iii. 16 πλὴν . . . τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν is the Inf. most easily taken for the Imperat.; it points out here with peculiar effect the unchanging law of progress for the Christian life. Cf. Stallb. ad Plat. Gorg. 447 b.

To the imperative ἵνα under a. Gieseler in Rosenm. Repert. II. 145 refers the use of a ἵνα in John etc., as in Jno. i. 8 οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ but he was to bear witness; ix. 3; xiii. 18. But the 333 construction can only have this meaning when ἵνα signifies *in order that*;

¹ Thus in laws and moral rules in Hesiod. opp. et dd., in Theognis, in Hippocrates, in Marc. Anton. See Gayler, partic. negant. p. 80 sq.

and then an ellipsis, at least of a general kind, as *γέγονε τοῦτο*,¹ underlies the usage, though John himself in consequence of frequent use regarded it in particular passages as nothing more than *but in order that*, cf. Fr. Mt. 840 sq. An expositor, on the contrary, if he wishes to do his duty, can and must in every case give naturally the special ellipsis from the context; as, Jno. i. 8 *he himself was not the light of the world*, but he came (*ἦλθεν* vs. 7) *that he might bear witness*; ix. 3 *neither hath this man sinned nor his parents, but he was born blind that . . . might be made manifest* (cf. 1 Jno. ii. 19). In xiii. 18 there is probably an aposiopesis, which may be easily explained psychologically: *I speak not of you all, I know those whom I have chosen, but (I have made this choice) that . . . might be fulfilled* etc.; see BCrus. (if we do not prefer to suppose that Jesus, instead of giving utterance to the painful fact in his own language, continues in the words of the Psalmist, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9). In Jno. xv. 25 *ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν* in the quotation shows that *μεμισήκασιν* must be repeated before *ἵνα*. In Mark xiv. 49 the coming forth of the Jews against Jesus, in the manner described in vs. 48, is understood as predicted. Lastly, in Rev. xiv. 13 from *ἀποθνήσκοντες* the word *ἀποθνήσκουσι* may be supplied before *ἵνα* etc.

Note. In the N. T. text it is occasionally doubtful, whether a verbal form that answers equally for the Imperat. and (the 2d person of) the Indic. is to be taken for the former or the latter; e.g. Heb. xii. 17 *ἵστε*, 284 6th ed. *ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομήσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπεδοκιμάσθη*, [xiii. 23] 1 Cor. vi. 4 *βιωτικά μὲν οὖν κριτήρια ἂν ἔχητε, τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοὺτους καθίζετε*, i. 26; xi. 26; Rom. xiii. 6; Eph. ii. 22; Phil. ii. 15, 22; Jno. xiv. 1; 1 Pet. i. 6; ii. 5. In all such cases the decision must depend on the context; and the question belongs not to Grammar but to Hermeneutics.

§ 44. THE INFINITIVE.²

298

7th ed.

1. The Infinitive, inasmuch as it expresses the idea of the verb purely and simply i.e. without reference to a subject, is least qualified of all the verbal forms to figure as a part of speech in a 334 grammatical sentence. It is so used, a. in expressing a concise, hurried command (§ 43, 5 d.); or, b. when introduced adverbially; or, c. subjoined absolutely. Under b. comes only the phrase *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν* Heb. vii. 9 (Krü. 178). To c. may be referred (Krü. 179) Phil. iv. 10 *ἀνεθάτετε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν* as *to your regard*

¹ To say that there is nothing to be supplied (as de Wette does), is not satisfactory; at any rate it must be shown how and by what means *ἵνα* assumes that import.

² K. E. A. Schmidt on the Infinitive. Prenzlau, 1823. 8vo.; M. Schmidt on the Infin. Ratibor, 1826. 8vo.; Eichhoff on the Infin. Crefeld, 1833. 8vo. Cf. Mehlhorn in the allgem. Lit. Z. 1833. Ergzbl. nr. 110.

for me, though another construction also is possible here. But an Inf. which is added to a clause as its complement (infin. epexegeticus), generally to express *design* (Rost 687), is related to the last use, or rather coincides with it essentially, Matt. ii. 2 ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ (in order) to worship him (after ἔρχομαι Matt. xi. 7; xx. 28; Heb. ix. 24; Rev. xxii. 12; Jno. iv. 15; Luke i. 17, and πέμπω or ἀποστέλλω Mark iii. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17; xvi. 3, and, besides, Acts v. 31; Rom. x. 7; 1 Cor. x. 7); 2 Cor. xi. 2 ἡρμουςάμην ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνὴν παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ, Col. i. 22; 2 Cor. ix. 5; x. 13, 16; Jno. xiii. 24 νέει τούτῳ πυθέσθαι (cf. Diod. S. 20, 69), Rev. xvi. 9 οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι αὐτῷ δόξαν, 2 Pet. iii. 2 (1 Sam. xvi. 1) Phil. iv. 12. In other passages it denotes the result (as, in the early language, design and result were not yet distinguished, Bmln. S. 339) Col. iv. 6 ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν . . . ἁλατι ἡρτυμένος . . . εἶδέναι πῶς etc. seasoned with salt, to know (so that ye may know), Heb. v. 5; or the mode of carrying into effect, as in Acts xv. 10 τί πειράζετε τὸν θεὸν ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν imponendo jugum, Heb. v. 5 (1 Pet. iv. 3). Lastly, in Eph. iii. 6 the Infin. clause gives the substance of the μυστήριον vs. 4; cf. also Eph. iv. 22. In Greek authors this lax use of the Inf. is carried much farther, Schaef. Soph. II. 324; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. 116; Held, Plut. Aem. P. 185 sq. The Inf. of design is particularly frequent (Soph. Oed. C. 12; Thuc. 1, 50; 4, 8; Her. 7, 208; Plut. Cim. 5; Arrian. Al. 1, 16, 10; 4, 16, 4) 285 Mtth. 1234; Krü. 186 (though the Greeks, after verbs of going
6th ed. or sending, still more frequently employ the Participle, cf. Acts viii. 27; xxiv. 11).

Such relations are more distinctly denoted sometimes by ὥστε before the Inf., as in Luke ix. 52; Matt. xxvii. 1. On the above passage in Matt. 9 where the explanation of Fr. is very far-fetched cf. Strab. 6, 324; Schaef. 6th ed. ad Bos ellips. p. 784, and Soph. Oed. Col. p. 525; Mtth. 1232. In the Byzantine writers ὥστε with the Inf. instead of the Inf. alone is peculiarly common, e.g. Malal. p. 385 ἐβουλεύσατο ὥστε ἐκβληθῆναι τὴν πενθεράν, p. 434. Cf. also Heinichen. ind. ad Euseb. III. 545. A parallel to Luke, as above, occurs in Euseb. H. E. 3, 28, 3: εἰσελθεῖν ποτε ἐν βαλανεῖ ὥστε λούσασθαι 335 This extended use of the particle in the later language it is better to recognize in the N. T. also, than to consent to forced interpretations. Ὡς before the Inf. occurs only in Acts xx. 24 οὐδενὸς λόγον ποιῶμαι, οὐδὲ ἔχω τὴν ψυχὴν μου τιμᾶν ἐμαυτῷ, ὡς τελειῶσαι τὸν δρόμον μου μετὰ χαρᾶς in order to finish my course etc., see Bornem. Schol. p. 174 sq.

Other forms of the Infin. epexeget. are more naturally annexed

to a proposition or a clause, and assumed the form of a grammatically governed word, which they were considered to be in part by earlier grammarians:¹ a. Mark vii. 4 *πολλὰ ἂ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν* (observanda acceperunt), Matt. xxvii. 34 *ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν ὄξος*, Eph. iii. 16 (Thuc. 2, 27; 4, 36; Lucian. asin. 43; Diog. L. 2, 51). b. 1 Cor. ix. 5 *ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν γυναῖκα περιάγειν*, ix. 4; Luke viii. 8 *ὁ ἔχων ὅτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω*, ii. 1; Acts xiv. 5; Eph. iii. 8; Heb. xi. 15 *καιρὸς ἀνακάμψαι*, iv. 1 (Plato, Tim. 38 b.; Aesch. dial. 3, 2) Mtth. 1235. In this construction a subject even may be added to the Inf., as in Rom. xiii. 11; cf. Schoem. Plut. Cleom. 187.

The Inf. is construed with Adjectives in 2 Tim. i. 12 *δυνατὸς τὴν παραθήκην μου φυλάξαι* (Thuc. 1, 139.), Heb. xi. 6; vi. 10 *οὐκ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι* etc., 1 Pet. iv. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 39; Mark i. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 5; Luke xv. 19; Acts xiii. 25; Heb. v. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Luke xxii. 33. Cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 117; Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. 204; Weber, Demosth. 261; Bhdy. 361.

2. But the Inf. may also enter into the construction of a sentence as an integral part of it; and then its nature as a noun more or less clearly appears. In such cases it is used sometimes as the subject and sometimes as the object. It serves as subject (Mtth. 1239) in sentences such as Matt. xii. 10 *εἰ ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεύειν* *is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day* (is healing etc. lawful)? xv. 26 *οὐκ ἔστι καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων*, 1 Thess. iv. 3 28δ *τοῦτο ἐστὶ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἀπέχεσθαι ... ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας* (where ^{6th ed.} *ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν* precedes, which also might have been expressed by an Inf.), Acts xx. 16 *ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι* (Weber, 336 Dem. 213), Matt. xix. 10; Eph. v. 12; Phil. i. 7; Gal. vi. 14; Jas. 300 i. 27; Rom. xiii. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 20; Heb. vi. 6; ix. 27; 1 Pet. ii. 15. ^{7th ed.} If in such cases the Infin. itself has a subject, whether a substantive, adjective, or participle, this is usually connected grammatically with the Inf. and put in the Accusative; as, Matt. xvii. 4 *καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὥδε εἶναι*, xix. 24; Jno. xviii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 15; Acts xxv. 27; Luke ix. 33; xviii. 25. Cf. Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 526; Schwarz, de soloec. discip. Ch. p. 88 sq. When the subject is subjoined to the leading clause (Phil. i. 7 *δίκαιον ἐμοὶ*

¹ Likewise by those who thought that in the example adduced under b. *ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν περιάγειν*, a *τοῦ* is omitted before the Inf. (Haitinger in Act. Monac. III. 301): this is put when the Inf. is regarded definitely as a Gen. (noun); without *τοῦ* it is the Inf. epexeget. The two constructions are somewhat differently conceived, Mtth. 1235. So in Latin, Cic. Tusc. 1, 41: *tempus est abire* (cf. Ramshorn S. 423), in other passages *obvendi*. See in general Stallb. Plat. Phil. p. 213 and Euthyphr. p. 107. (As in Luke i. 9 we find *ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμῶσαι*, so in Demosth. Neaer. 517 c. *λαγχάνει βουλευέιν*.)

τοῦτο φρονεῖν etc.), the adjectives construed with the Infin. stand either in the Acc. (Matt. xviii. 8 καλὸν σοὶ ἐστὶν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ κυλλόν), or in the case of the subject, according to an attraction common in Greek authors; as, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς, μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ἐπιστρέψαι, Acts xv. 25 (var.) cf. Thuc. 2, 87; Demosth. funebr. 153 a., 156 a.; Xen. Hier. 10, 2; Bhdy. 359; Krü. 180 (Zumpt 505). In Heb. ii. 10 both constructions are united: ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ . . . ἀγαγόντα . . . τελειῶσαι cf. Mark ix. 47; Matt. xviii. 8 (Plut. Coriol. 14).

It is further to be remarked that

a. The Inf. in this case sometimes has the Article: viz. where it serves directly as a verbal noun, which takes place not only in sentences such as Rom. vii. 18 τὸ θέλει παράκειται μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν σὺ, 2 Cor. vii. 11 αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ θεὸν λυπηθῆναι πόσῃ κατεργάσατο ὑμῖν σπουδῇ, Phil. i. 21, where the finite verb with its adjuncts forms a complete predicate; but also in the impersonal phrases καλόν, αἰσχρόν ἐστι etc. (Rost 681), if special force is intended to be given to the notion expressed by the Inf. e.g. 1 Cor. vii. 26 καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι, Gal. iv. 18 καλὸν τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. xi. 6. In the former case the Article could hardly be omitted; but in the latter καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ οὕτως εἶναι *it is good for a man so to be* (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 1; xiv. 35) would have been less forcible in expression.¹ Phil. i. 29 may also be reckoned in the second class; in 1 Thess. iv. 6 one such Inf. with the Article is followed by another without it (cf. Plat. Gorg. 467 d.; Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 76); but in Rom. iv. 13 the Inf. τὸ κληρονόμον εἶναι appears as a species of apposition to ἡ ἐπαγγελία. In Greek authors compare with the above, Plat. Phaed. 62 d.; Gorg. 475 b.; Xen. M. 1, 2, 1; Diod. S. 1, 98.

b. Instead of the Inf., especially when its subject is to be expressed with special force, a complete clause also is used with ἔάν, εἰ, ἵνα (according to the import); as, Mark xiv. 21 καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, 1 Cor. vii. 8 καλὸν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν, ἔάν μείνωσιν ὡς καγώ, Jno. xvi. 7 συμφέροι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω. Respecting ἵνα, see below; no. 8. This is in part a general peculiarity of the (later) popular language, which prefers circumstantiality; in part it is to be referred to the Hellenistic tinge of the N. T. diction. Yet something similar occurs in Greek authors, as in Isocr. Nicocl. p. 40, 46.

Likewise, when the Inf. is joined with ἐστὶ in the sense of *it is lawful*, or *it is possible* etc. to . . ., the Inf. is itself the subject; as, Heb. ix. 5 (Ast, lexic. Plat. I. 622 a.). But 1 Cor. xi. 20 may (in opposition to Wahl and

¹ A difference in meaning between an Inf. with the Art. and without it is certainly not to be assumed. In German, too, none such exists between *das Beten* ist segensreich and *beten* ist segensreich. Yet the Inf. becomes more forcible when used as a substantive with the Article.

Mey.) be further rendered : *when ye come together, it is (means) not to eat the Lord's Supper.* Τοῦτο in resumption of the Gen. abs. is not required.

3. The Inf. denotes the object (predicate) in all cases when it is requisite to complete the meaning of a verb, not only after θέλειν, δύνασθαι, τολμᾶν, ἐπιχειρεῖν, σπουδάζειν, ζητεῖν,¹ etc., but also after verbs of *believing, hoping* (I hope to come, etc.), *saying, asserting.* The regular usage need not be proved from the N. T., and therefore we have merely to remark,

a. If, in such case, the Inf. has its own subject different from that of the principal verb, such subject with all its attributives is put in the accusative (Acc. with Infin.); as, 1 Tim. ii. 8 βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας, 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Heb. vi. 11 ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν etc., 2 Pet. i. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 10; Acts xiv. 19 νομίσαντες αὐτὸν τεθνάναι, 2 Cor. xi. 16 μή τις με δόξη ἄφρονα εἶναι,² Rom. xv. 5 ὁ θεὸς δόξῃ ὑμῶν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, 2 Tim. i. 18. Yet, more frequently we find a complete clause with ἵνα after verbs of *entreating, commanding,* etc. (see no. 8), with ὅτι after verbs of *saying, believing* (Matt. xx. 10; Acts xix. 26; xxi. 29; Rom. iv. 9; viii. 18; Gal. v. 10), and always in the N. T. after ἐλπίζω. If, on the other hand, the Inf. and the principal verb have one and the same subject, the qualifying words, if such there be, are subjoined in the Nominative; as, Rom. xv. 24 ἐλπίζω διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς, 2 Cor. x. 2 δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι (Philostr. Apoll. 2, 23), Rom. i. 22; Phil. iv. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 14; Jude 3 (Luke i. 9?),³ which is a kind of attraction; cf. Krüger, gramm. Untersuch. III. 328 ff. The subject itself is then not repeated; as, Jas. ii. 14; 1 Cor. vii. 36. 338 Even in this construction, however, the Accusative (with Inf.) may be used, yet only when the subject is repeated in the form of 302 a pronoun (Hm. Vig. 743), though this does not often occur; as, 7th ed. Rom. ii. 19 πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, Phil. iii. 13 ἐγὼ ἑμαυτὸν οὐ λογιζομαι κατειληφέναι, Luke xx. 20 ὑποκρινομένους, ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, Acts xxvi. 2; Rev. ii. 2, 9, perhaps also Eph. 288 iv. 22 (where, as appears to me, ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς depends on ἐδιδά- 8th ed.

¹ In opposition to Bornem. Schol. p. 40 see Fr. Rom. II. 376; cf. Blume, Lycurg. p. 151.

² If the governed substantive to which the Inf. refers be in the Dative, the noun accompanying the Infin. may also be in the Dative, as in Acts xxvii. 3 ... τῷ Παύλῳ χρησόμενος ἐπέτρεψεν πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντι ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τυχεῖν, unless the Dative here is a correction; see Bornem. On the other hand, we find in Luke i. 74 τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν ἀφ' ὧν ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν βυσθέντας λατρεύειν αὐτῷ etc.

³ So also in 1 Tim. i. 3 πορευόμενος belongs to παρεκλέσα. If connected with προσμεῖναι it would necessarily, in such proximity, appear in the Accusative.

χθῆτε) cf. Her. 2, 2; Xen. C. 5, 1, 21 νομίζοιμι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν ἐοικέναι etc., 1, 4, 4 (where see Poppo); Anab. 7, 1, 30; Mem. 2, 6, 35; Diod. S. 1, 50; Exc. Vat. p. 57; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 12; see Krüger as above, S. 390. Yet in the former passages this construction was preferred probably for the sake of antithesis (see Plat. symp. c. 3, and Stallb. in loc., cf. Krüger as above, S. 386 f.) or of perspicuity: *I deem not that I myself have already* etc. For the same reason, also, ὑμᾶς, in Eph. as above, appears to be employed, since in vs. 21 another subject, Jesus, has intervened. Later writers, however, use this construction even when no antithesis is intended, cf. Heinichen, Euseb. H. E. I. 118.

b. After verbs of *saying*, (*asserting*), *believing*, the Inf. is sometimes used when the assertion etc. refers not to something that really *is*, but to something that *should be* (such verbs containing rather the notion of advice, claim, or command; see also Elmsley, Soph. Oed. T. p. 80; Mtth. 1230); as, Acts xxi. 21 λέγων, μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα *he said they ought not to circumcise their children* (he commanded them not to circumcise etc.) xv. 24? Tit. ii. 2; Acts xxi. 4 τῷ Παύλῳ ἔλεγον μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱεροσ. *they said to Paul that he should not go up* (advised him not to go) etc. cf. Eurip. Troad. 724. In all these cases if the statement were resolved into direct address the Imperative would be used: μὴ περιτέμνετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν. Compare on this Inf. (which even recent writers still explain by supposing the omission of δέω, see in opposition Hm. Vig. 745) Lob. Phryn. p. 753 sqq.; Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 131; Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 81; Jen. Lit. Zeit. 1816. No. 231; Bhdy. 371. Too many passages, however, of the N. T. have been referred to this head. Rom. xiv. 2 δ; μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα means: *one man has confidence to eat*, and the *may* is already implied in πιστεύειν. In xv. 9 δοξάσαι denotes, not what the Gentiles should do, but what they actually do; see Fr. In ii. 21 f. and Eph. iv. 22 f. (see above) the verbs *to make known* and *to be instructed*, on which the Infinitives depend, inherently denote as well what is (and must be believed) as what ought to be (should be done); and, in the same way, we can say: *they preached to*
 339 *them not to steal; ye have been taught to lay aside*. In Acts x. 22 χρηματίζεσθαι occurs, which is almost uniformly employed to denote the direction of an oracle, a divine injunction. Finally, when
 803 after verbs of *beseeching* the Inf. must be rendered by *may*, such import is comprehended in the meaning of those verbs in the
 12th ed. context in question, as in 2 Cor. x. 2 δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι

τῇ πεποιθήσει, as if, I beseech you in reference to my not being bold, that is, to see that I be not bold.¹

c. The Article is put before the Inf. when it is the object, to make it a substantive, and thus give it greater prominence (Rost 682) Rom. xiii. 8; xiv. 13 (Luke vii. 21 var.); 1 Cor. iv. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 1; viii. 10; Phil. iv. 10; cf. above, 1 (Hm. Soph. Aj. 114); especially at the beginning of the sentence (Thuc. 2, 53; Xenoph. M. 4, 3, 1), 1 Cor. xiv. 39 τὸ λαλεῖν γλώσσας μὴ κωλύετε (cf. Soph. Phil. 1241 ὃς σε κωλύσει τὸ δρᾶν). In Phil. ii. 6 οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, the Inf. with the Article is the immediate object of ἡγήσ., and ἄρπαγμ. is predicate, cf. Thuc. 2, 87 οὐχὶ δικαίαν ἔχει τέκμαρσιν τὸ ἐκφοβῆναι, and Bhdy. 316.

Especially deserving of attention is the use (in Luke peculiarly frequent) of the Inf. with the Acc. after ἐγένετο, as in Mark ii. 23 ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτόν *accidit, ut transiret*, Acts xvi. 16 ἐγέν. παιδίσκην τινα . . . ἀπαντῆσαι ἡμῖν, xix. 1 ἐγέν. Παῦλον διελθόντα . . . ἔλθεῖν εἰς Ἐφεσον, iv. 5; ix. 3, 32, 37, 43; xi. 26; xiv. 1; xxi. 1, 5; xxii. 6; xxvii. 44; xxviii. 8, 17; Luke iii. 21 f.; vi. 1, 6; xvi. 22 etc.² Here the Infinitive clause is to be considered as the (extended) subject of ἐγένετο, just as after συνέβη (see just below), and in Latin after *aequum est*, *apertum est*, etc. (Zumpt, Gr. 505): *Jesus' passing by came to pass*, etc. The construction is good Greek, though the frequent use of ἐγένετο with the Inf., instead of the historical tense of the particular verb, is primarily an imitation of the Hebrew וַיְהִי. In Greek we find a grammatical parallel in συνέβη τὴν πόλιν . . . εἶναι κυριεύουσιν Diod. S. 1, 50; 3, 22, 39; Plat. legg. 1, 635 a.; Demosth. Polycl. 709 c.; Dion. H. IV. 2089, and frequently, particularly in Polybius (also 2 Macc. iii. 2), which occurs also once in Acts xxi. 35. The germ of the former construction may be seen in Theogn. 639 πολλὰκι . . . γίγνεται εἰρῆν ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν, with which Matt. xviii. 13 agrees most closely. It appears in its full form in Plat. Phaedr. 242 b. τὸ δαιμόνιον τε καὶ τὸ εἰωθὸς σημειὸν μοι γίγνεσθαι ἐγένετο; and especially in later writers, e.g. Codin. p. 138 ἐγένετο τὸν βασιλέα ἀθυμεῖν, Epiphan. Monach. ed. Dressel p. 16 ἐγένετο αὐτοὺς ἀναβῆναι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

The use of the Acc. with the Inf., as has been already remarked, is elsewhere in the N. T. comparatively rare. A clause with *ὅτι* is more

¹ In 2 Cor. ii. 7 ὅστε . . . χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσας the two Infinitives in the same way denote what should be, and not what actually takes place. Yet even here *δεῖν* is not to be supplied, but the clause with *ἵκανόν* extends its influence to these Infinitives: The reproach is sufficient,—that you may now, on the contrary, forgive him etc.

² The same construction is followed in Acts xxii. 17 ἐγένετό μοι ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ . . . γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει, where the Infn. might have been joined directly to μοι ὑποστ. (*accidit mihi*), and perhaps would have been joined to it had not the writer been led to depart from this construction by the intervention of the Gen. abs. καὶ προσευχομένου μου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.

304 common, quite after the manner of the later (popular) language, which
 7th ed. resolves condensed constructions, and prefers the more circumstantial and
 perspicuous. Hence in Latin e.g. *ut* where the more ancient language
 employed the Acc. with the Inf.; hence, especially, the *quod* after verbs
dicendi and *sentiendi* which in the period of declining Latin (particularly
 in the extra-Italian provinces) becomes more and more frequent. In Ger-
 man the concise construction, "He said I had come too late," is resolved
 in the speech of the people into "He said *that* I," etc. Moreover, it must
 290 not be overlooked that after verbs *dicendi* the N. T. likes to introduce
 6th ed. what is said in the oratio recta, according to the graphic idiom of Oriental
 tongues.

4. The Inf. rendered an unmistakable substantive by means of the Article is also employed in the oblique cases. When so used it appears in the N. T. most frequently (far more so than in Greek authors) in the Genitive. Sometimes,

a. it depends on nouns or verbs which elsewhere also govern the Genitive: 1 Cor. ix. 6 οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι; 1 Pet. iv. 17 ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα etc., Acts xiv. 9 πίστιν ἔχει τοῦ σωθῆναι, xx. 3 ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν, Luke xxiv. 25 βραδεὺς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν, Acts xxiii. 15 ἑτοιμοὶ τοῦ ἀνελεῖν (Sept. Ezek. xxi. 11; 1 Macc. v. 39); Luke i. 9 ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιάσαι (1 Sam. xiv. 47); 2 Cor. i. 8 ὥστε ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν, 1 Cor. xvi. 4 εἰ ἂν ᾗ ἄξιον τοῦ καμῆ πορεύεσθαι if it be worthy of my going also. Cf. also 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Cor. viii. 11; Luke xxii. 6; Phil. iii. 21; Rom. vii. 3; xv. 23; Heb. v. 12; Rev. ix. 10 (Sept. Gen. xix. 20; Ruth ii. 10; Neh. x. 29; Judith ix. 14, etc.). Sometimes the Codd. vary between the Inf. with τοῦ and without it, as in Rev. xiv. 15 (in other passages we find, in parallel phrases, sometimes the one and sometimes the other, Heb. v. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 9). For passages from Greek authors, see Georgi, vind. 325 sq.; Mtth. 1256. (In these, several words frequently intervene between the Article and the Inf.; but this does not occur in the N. T., owing to the simplicity of its diction. See Demosth. funebr. 153 a., 154 c.; Aristocr. 431 a.)

Under this head come also Luke i. 57 ἐπλήσθη ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν, ii. 21, cf. Sept. Gen. xxv. 24; xlvii. 29, as in writing Greek the
 841 author regarded the Gen. as depending immediately on χρόνος. In Hebrew the construction is somewhat different, the Inf. with ᾧ being used; see Ewald 621.

Sometimes, b. it is construed with entire clauses, to express *design* (see Valcken. Eurip. Hippol. 48; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 56;

Schaefer. Demosth. II. 161; V. 368; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 338; Mtth. 1256 f.), where the earlier philologists supplied *ἐνεκα* (cf. Dem. funebr. 156 b.) or *χάριν*, as Luke xxiv. 29 *εἰςῆλθεν τοῦ μέναι σὺν αὐτοῖς*, Matt. xxiv. 45 *ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν*, iii. 13 *παραγίνεται ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι*, xiii. 3; Luke ii. 27; v. 7; xxi. 22; xxii. 31; Acts iii. 2; xxvi. 18; 1 Cor. x. 13; Heb. x. 7; Gal. iii. 10; with 305 a negative in Acts xxi. 12 *παρακαλοῦμεν . . . τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτὸν* ^{7th ed.} *εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*, Jas. v. 17; Heb. xi. 5. This construction is especially peculiar to Luke (and Paul). But in Greek prose, particularly after the time of Demosthenes, parallel instances occur; and this use of the Genitive results so surely from the primary import of the case itself (Bhdy. 174 f.), that no one should venture to find in it either an ellipsis or a Hebraism. Cf. Xen. C. 1, 6, 40 *τοῦ δὲ μηδ' ἐντεῦθεν διαφεύγειν, σκοποῦς τοῦ γιγνομένου καθίστης*. Plat. Gorg. 457 e. *φοβοῦμαι οὖν διελέγχειν σε, μή με ὑπολάβῃς οὐ πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα φιλονεικοῦντα λέγειν, τοῦ καταφανὲς γενέσθαι* etc. Strabo 15, 717; Demosth. Phorm. 603 b.; Isocr. Aegin. 932; Thuc. 291 1, 23; 2, 22; Heliod. 2, 8, 88; 1, 24, 46; Dion. H. IV. 2109; ^{6th ed.} Arrian. Al. 2, 21, 13; 3, 25, 4 and 28, 12. An Inf. with, and another without *τοῦ*, are connected in the same principal clause in Luke ii. 22 f. If a subject is expressed in this construction it is put in the Acc. Luke v. 7.

In Phil. iii. 10 also this Inf. denotes design, where *τοῦ γινῶναι* is connected with vs. 8 and resumes the thought there expressed. (In the Sept. this Inf. occurs on every page, cf. Gen. i. 14; xxiv. 21; xxxviii. 9; xliii. 17; Judg. v. 16; ix. 15, 52; x. 1; xi. 12; xv. 12; xvi. 5; xix. 3; xx. 4; Ruth i. 1, 7; ii. 15; iv. 10; Neh. i. 6; 1 Sam. ix. 13, 14; xv. 27; 2 Sam. vi. 2; xix. 11; Jonah i. 3; Joel iii. 12; Judith xv. 8; 1 Macc. iii. 20, 39, 52; v. 9, 20, 48; vi. 15, 26.)

Different from this, and more closely connected with the notion of the Genitive — hence to be referred to a. — is the use of the Inf. with *τοῦ* after verbs signifying to *be distant from*, to *restrain or debar from*, to *prevent from*; for these verbs contain the inherent power of directly governing the Gen., and accordingly are uniformly followed by the Gen. of a noun, as Rom. xv. 22 *ἐνεκοπτόμην . . . τοῦ ἐλθεῖν*, Luke iv. 42 *κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι* (cf. Isocr. ep. 7, 1012 *ἀπέχει τοῦ τινος ἀποκτείνειν*, Xen. M. 2, 1, 16; A. 3, 5, 11), with a pleonastic negative 342 (§ 65) Acts xiv. 18 *μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς* (cf. *παύειν τινά τινος* and *παύεσθαι* followed by Inf. with *τοῦ* Diod. S. 3, 33; Phalar. ep. 35, also *ἡσυχάζειν τοῦ ποιεῖν* Malalas 17, p. 417), xx. 27 *οὐχ ὑπεστειδάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ* (cf. vs. 20),

1 Pet. iii. 10 παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεῖλη αὐτοῦ τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον, Luke xxiv. 16 οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν (Xen. Laced. 4, 6), Rom. vi. 6; Acts x. 47 (Sus. 9; 3 Esr. ii. 24; v. 69, 70; Gen. xvi. 2; Act. Thom. § 19; Protev. Jac. 2 etc.). Perhaps also φεύγειν and ἐκφεύγειν τοῦ ποιῆσαι is best explained in this way (as φεύγειν τινός is used), Xen. A. 1, 3, 2. Cf. Bhdy. 356; Bttm. exc. II. ad Demosth. Mid. p. 143.

In Rom. i. 24 παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ... εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς the Inf. depends directly on the noun ἀκαθαρσ., 306 and there is nothing strange in the omission of τὴν before ἀκαθ. (xv. 23; 7th ed. 1 Cor. ix. 6). The Gen. indicates in what this ἀκαθ. consisted: commisit impuritati, quae cernebatur in etc. Fr. with more detail says: virgula post ἀκαθαρσ. collocata ante τοῦ mente repete ἀκαθαρσίαν. The need of this I cannot perceive, as ἀκαθαρσ. and ἀτιμάζ. stand close together, and the Gen. may naturally be understood of the sphere of the ἀκαθαρσ. In the same way, too, in Rom. viii. 12 the Inf. τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν is to be understood as depending on ὀφειλέτην, in conformity to the regular phrase ὀφειλέτην εἶναι τις; see Fr. Matt. p. 844. Finally, in Luke i. 73 τοῦ δοῦναι in the same way is most naturally connected with ὄρκον, cf. Jer. xi. 5.

It soon became usual, however, to employ this construction more loosely, not only a) After verbs involving the idea of (*entreaty*)¹ 292 *command*,² *determination*, and thus indirectly of *design*, Acts xv. 20 6th ed. κρινῶ ... ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι to send them the direction to abstain, Luke iv. 10 (from the Sept.) τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι, Acts xxvii. 1 (where it would be forced to connect τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν with the following παρεδίδουν), cf. Ruth ii. 9; 1 Kings i. 35; 1 Macc. i. 62; iii. 31; v. 2; ix. 69; Malal. Chron. 18, 458; Ducas p. 201, 217, 339, a.; Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 707; Vit. Epiph. p. 346; — but also, b) For exegesis, where an Inf. with or without ὥστε might have been used, and the import of the Gen. is lost by blending result and design. Very frequently so in the Sept.; (ᾧ with the Inf. denotes both design and result; as to εἰς with the Inf. see afterwards). In the N. T. compare Acts vii. 19 οὗτος κατασοφισάμενος ... ἐκάκωσε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκθετα τὰ βρέφη etc., so that they cast out (cf. Thuc. 2, 42, and Poppe in loc.), and what is still harsher iii. 12 ὡς πεποιηκόσι τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν (1 Kings xvi. 19). In both

¹ Cf. Malalas 14, 357 ἡγήσατο ἡ Αἰγύπτια τὸν βασιλέα, τοῦ κατελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους τόπους, 17, 422 πυκνῶς ἔγραψε τοῖς αὐτοῖς πατρικίοις τοῦ φροντισθῆναι τὴν πόλιν, 18, 440 κελεύσας τοῦ δοθῆναι αὐταῖς χάριν προικὸς ἀνὰ χρυσίου λιτρῶν εἰκοσι etc. 18, 461.

² A construction parallel to κελεύειν ἵνα.

these passages Fr.'s exposition (Matt. p. 846) is undoubtedly to be rejected; otherwise, many passages of the Sept. would either be inexplicable, or would admit of but a very forced interpretation. Cf. in particular Josh. xxii. 26 εἶπαμεν ποιῆσαι οὕτω τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι, 1 Kings xiii. 16 οὐ μὴ δύνωμαι τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι (1 Macc. vi. 27), xvi. 19 ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ, ὧν ἐποίησε τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ ποιηρὸν etc., Judith xiii. 20 ποιῆσαι σοι αὐτὰ δὲ θεὸς εἰς ὕψος αἰώνιον τοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαι σε ἐν ἀγαθοῖς, 1 Macc. vi. 59 στήσωμεν αὐτοῖς τοῦ πορεύεσθαι τοῖς νομίμοις, Joel ii. 21 ἐμεγάλυνε κύριος τοῦ ποιῆσαι.

How diversified the use of the Inf. with τοῦ in the Sept. is, may be seen from the following passages (which can easily be classified and which exhibit more or less distinctly the relation denoted by the Genitive): Gen. xxxi. 20; xxxiv. 17; xxxvii. 18; xxxix. 10; Exod. ii. 18; vii. 14; 307 viii. 29; ix. 17; xiv. 5; Josh. xxiii. 13; Judg. ii. 17, 21, 22; viii. 1; ix. 24, 7th ed. 37; xii. 6; xvi. 6; xviii. 9; xxi. 3, 7; 1 Sam. vii. 8; xii. 23; xiv. 34; xv. 26; 1 Kings ii. 3; iii. 11; xii. 24; xv. 21; xvi. 7, 31; Ps. xxxix. 14; Jonah i. 4; iii. 4; Mal. ii. 10; 3 Esr. i. 33; iv. 41; v. 67; Judith ii. 13; v. 4; vii. 13; Ruth i. 12, 16, 18; iii. 3; iv. 4, 7, 15. See also Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 20; Tdf. in the Verhandeling. p. 141. Cf. Acta apocr. p. 68, 85, 124, 127, etc. This Infin. is by no means unfrequent in Byzantine authors; as, Malal. 18, 452; 18, 491; cf. Index to Ducas p. 639, where p. 320 even εἰ βούλεται τοῦ εἶναι φίλος occurs, cf. p. 189, and p. 203 δύναται τοῦ ἀνταποκριθῆναι. This use of τοῦ must be recognized as an extravagance of declining (Hellenistic) Greek, unless forced interpretations be preferred. In Hellenistic writers this construction appears to have become the counterpart of the Inf. with ῥ in its manifold relations; and, as generally 293 takes place in established phrases, they no longer thought of the original 6th ed. Genitive force.¹ Analogous to this, moreover, is the Byzantine usage of inserting ὥστε before the Inf. after such verbs as βουλευέσθαι, δοκεῖν etc.; see Index to Malalas, Bonn ed.,² cf. above, no. 3.

In Rev. xii. 7 ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ 344 τοῦ πολεμῆσαι (where the received text has the correction ἐπολέμησαν) a construction occurs which I am unable to explain (Lücke, too, in his Einleit. in die Offenbar. Joh. 2 Aufl. S. 454 f., was unable), unless we may consider ὁ Μιχ. καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ as a parenthesis — awkward to be sure — which compelled the writer to resume then the ἐγέν. πόλεμος in the construction τοῦ πολεμ. Fr.'s exposition (Matt. p. 844) appears to me artificial. It would, however, be still more inadmissible to take τοῦ

¹ In Aesop. 172 de Fur. we find ἐμελλεν αὐτὸς τοῦ καταθῆσαι ταύτην, where Schüf. thinking solely of the above use of the Genitive Inf. (no. 4 b.) would reject the τοῦ.

² Even native Greeks could consider this Inf. after such verbs as δύναμαι, θέλω etc. as a sort of Genitive, inasmuch as the action expressed by the Inf. always depends on the principal verb as a part depends on the whole.

πολεμ. for an imitation of the (later) Hebrew פָּגְנָנְדִּים pugnandum iis erat, as Ewald and Züllig do. For even in the Sept. that construction is in no passage rendered so strangely. If ἐγένετο τοῦ πολεμῆσαι alone were the reading, there would be a parallel in Acts x. 25 (see just below), and the construction would be tolerably explicable. Perhaps, however, the passage contains an ancient gloss, or something fell out of the text, at an early period, before τοῦ πολεμ. There is no plausibility in the proposal of Bornem. (Jen. L. Z. 1845, nr. 183) to read: ἐγένετο πολέμιος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ Μιχαήλ etc.; and with Hengstenberg boldly to supply *had war* before τοῦ πολ. would be to make John chargeable with a strange latitude in the use of words. Acts x. 25 ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον, where τοῦ is critically established, cannot be compared to the usage mentioned by Gesen.

308 Lehrgeb. S. 786 f., for according to this it must have run: ἐγέν. ὁ Πέτρος
7th ed. τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν; this would be an extreme use of the Inf. with τοῦ¹ which in Luke certainly would be very surprising. Bornem. considers the whole clause as spurious, — but the reader is referred to B. himself for the manner in which he thinks the text should be made up. Likewise in Luke xvii. 1 ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα some Codd. omit the τοῦ. If it is genuine (both Lehm. and Tdf. have retained it), the Genitive is owing probably to the notion of distance or exclusion implied in ἀνένδεκτ., cf. above, no. 4 b. The view of Mey. is different.

5. The Dative of the Inf. denotes the *cause*, according to the
294 inherent import of that case, see § 31, 6 c. (Mtth. 1258; Schaef.
6th ed. Demosth. II. 163; Stallb. Plat. Tim. p. 203), 2 Cor. ii. 13 οὐκ ἔσχακα
ἀνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν Τίτον *because I found not*
etc.; cf. Xen. C. 4, 5, 9; Demosth. pac. 21 c., funebr. 156 b., ep. 4 p.
119 b.; Achill. Tat. 5, 24; Lucian. abdic. 5; Diog. L. 10, 27; Liban.
ep. 8; Athen. 9, 375; Joseph. antt. 14, 10, 1; Simplic. in Epict. enchir.
c. 38, p. 385; Schweigh. Agath. 5, 16. This Inf. is understood by
some as denoting *design* in 1 Thess. iii. 3 τῷ μηδένα σαίνεισθαι ἐν
345 ταῖς θλίψεσι *in order that no one be shaken* etc., as it were ‘for the
not being shaken’ (Schott. in loc.), a thought which is subordinate
to the εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι, and therefore was not expressed by a repetition
of this form. No such Dat. Infin., however, occurs in Greek; and
we must read with good Codd. [Sin. included] τὸ μηδένα σαίνεισθαι,
which has now been received into the text. See above, 1. Remark.

6. The Infinitive in an oblique case is often joined to a *preposition*, particularly in narration, and rather more frequently in the N. T. than in Greek authors. The Article is then never omitted (Hm.

¹ Cf. Acta apocr. p. 66 ὡς ἐγένετο τοῦ τελῆσαι αὐτοὺς διδάσκοντας etc. Under this head would come also Acts ii. 1 if the reading were καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις τοῦ συμπληροῦσθαι.

Vig. 702; Krü. 94),¹ though several words may be inserted between the Article and the Inf. (Acts viii. 11; Heb. xi. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 2);² as, Matt. xiii. 25 ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους *while men slept*, Gal. iv. 18; Luke i. 8; Acts viii. 6 (Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 5; Hiero 1, 6); iii. 26 εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν etc. *by turning away, in that he turns away* (Heb. iii. 12); Phil. i. 23 ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι *desire towards departing* (to depart), Jas. i. 19 βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι *slow to speak*, 1 Cor. x. 6 εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι 309 ὑμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν *to the end that ye be not etc.*, ix. 18; 2 Cor. 7th ed. iv. 4; vii. 3; Matt. xxvi. 2; Luke iv. 29; Acts vii. 19 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 5; An. 7, 8, 20) Rom. iv. 18 (see Philippi), 1 Thess. ii. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 6 εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον *so that we besought Titus* (lit., unto the beseeching etc.),³ Rom. vii. 5; Heb. xi. 3; Heb. ii. 15 διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν (through) *all their life-time*, Phil. i. 7 διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς *because I have you etc.*,⁴ Acts viii. 11; xviii. 2; Heb. vii. 23; x. 2; Luke ii. 4; Mark v. 4 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 5; Mem. 2, 1, 15; Aristot. rhet. 2, 13; Pol. 2, 5, 2); Jas. iv. 15 ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς *instead of your saying* (Xen. Apol. 8; Plat. 295 rep. 1, 343 a.); Matt. vi. 8 πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι *before your asking*, Luke ii. 21; xxii. 15; Acts xxiii. 15 (Zeph. ii. 2; Plato, Crit. 48d.); Matt. vi. 1 πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς *in order to be seen of them*, 2 Cor. iii. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Luke xviii. 1 ἔλεγεν παραβολὴν πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι *in reference to etc.*; Matt. xxvi. 32 μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με *after my resurrection*, when I 346 shall have been raised, Luke xii. 5; Mark i. 14; Acts vii. 4; xv. 13 (Herod. 2, 9, 6; 3, 5, 10); 2 Cor. vii. 12 εἶνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν (Demosth. fun. 516 a. b.; Plato, Sis. 390 b.; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 39. Also inscript. Rosett. 11).

Paul with peculiar frequency expresses purpose by the Infinitive with εἰς or πρὸς, while in such cases the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews prefers a derivative noun; see Schulz, Hebräerbr. S. 146 ff. But cf. also 1 Cor. vii. 35.

¹ On the other hand, cf. Theodoret. III. 424 ἀπὸ κυβεῖν τὸ ὄνομα, IV. 851 παρὰ συγκλῶσθαι, Psalt. Sal. 4, 9. Similar constructions sometimes occur in Greek prose (Bhdly. 354; Kühner II. 352), but it is uncertain.

² Yet not so many, and not entire clauses even, as frequently in Greek authors (Xen. Occ. 13, 6; Cyr. 4, 5, 9; 7, 5, 42 etc.). The adjuncts, too, are uniformly put *after* the Inf. An Inf. with ἄχρι or μέχρι never occurs; with ἕνεκα only once.

³ The rendering of the Inf. with εἰς by *so that* is unobjectionable, as εἰς is elsewhere employed to express alike either aim or result; cf. Eurip. Bacch. 1161.

⁴ Against the other exposition, according to which ὑμᾶς is taken as the subject, see *van Hengel* in loc. Even where the subject is placed *after* the Infinitive the proper construction is always to be determined by the context, e.g. Simplic. enchir. 13 p. 90 διὰ τὸ πολέμιους μμεῖσθαι τοὺς συγγυμναστὰς. Cf. Jno. i. 49.

If in this construction of the Inf. with a prep. a subject be annexed, it is put in the Acc. even when it is one and the same with the subject of the principal clause; as, Heb. vii. 24 ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ... ἔχει, Luke ii. 4. Predicates also stand then in the Acc.; as, Luke xi. 8 δώσει αὐτῷ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ φίλον; but cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 3 διὰ τὸ φιλομαθῆς εἶναι ... αὐτὸς ἀνθρώπα, Mith. 1284. Yet the attraction, which properly accounts for the Nominative, is also in other circumstances omitted in Greek authors.

The Inf. (without the Article) after πρὶν or πρὶν ἢ (Reitz, Lucian. IV. 501 ed. Lehm.), may be considered as Inf. nominascens; e.g. Jno. iv. 49 κατὰβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου is equivalent to πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθ. etc. The Inf. with this particle is employed not only in connection with a Fut. or Imperf. in reference to a still impending fact (Mith. 1200) Matt. xxvi. 34 310 7th ed. (Acts ii. 20); but also in reference to past events (Xen. C. 3, 3, 60; An. 1, 4, 13; Herod. 1, 10, 15) in connection with Preterites, Matt. i. 18; Acts vii. 2; Jno. viii. 58. As to πρὶν ἢ cf. Her. 2, 2; 4, 167.

7. The well-known distinction between the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor., as well as between the Inf. Aor. and Inf. Fut. (Hm. Vig. p. 773),¹ is for the most part very clearly observed in the N. T. The Inf. Aorist is employed,

a. In *narration* after a Preterite on which it depends (in accordance with that parity of tenses carefully observed in Greek, see Schaef. Demosth. III. 432; Stallb. Phileb. p. 86 and Phaed. p. 32); as, Mark ii. 4 μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσαι αὐτῷ ... ἀπεστέγασαν, xii. 296 12 ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, v. 3 οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι, Luke 6th ed. xviii. 13 οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπάραι, Jno. 347 vi. 21; vii. 44; Matt. i. 19; viii. 29; xiv. 23; xviii. 23; xxiii. 37; xxvi. 40; xxvii. 34; Mark vi. 19, 48; Luke vi. 48; x. 24; xv. 28; xix. 27; Acts x. 10; xvii. 3; xxv. 7; Col. i. 27; Gal. iv. 20; Philem. 14; Jude 3. This is quite regular, and requires no proof from Greek authors, Mdv. 188. (Sometimes, however, we find the Inf. Pres., as in Jno. xvi. 19; Acts xix. 33; Luke vi. 19, and in parallel passages the Inf. Pres. is used in Matt. xxiii. 37, while in Luke xiii. 34 the Inf. Aor.) Likewise the Inf. Aor. is uniformly connected with the Imp. Aor.; as, Matt. viii. 22 ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς, xiv. 28; Mark vii. 27.

¹ Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 140: Aoristus (Infin.) quia nullam facit significationem perpetuitatis et continuationis, prouti vel initium vel progressus vel finis actionis verbo expressae spectatur, ita solet usurpari, ut dicatur vel de eo, quod statim et e vestigio fit ideoque etiam certo futurum est, vel de re semel tantum eveniente, quae diuturnitatis et perpetuitatis cogitationem aut non fert aut certe non requirit, vel denique de re brevi et uno veluti temporis ictu peracta.

b. After any tense, when an action (rapidly) passing, completed at once, or instantly to begin, is to be expressed (Hm. Vig. as above); as, Mark xiv. 31 *ἐάν με δέη συναποθανεῖν σοι*, xv. 31 *ἐαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι*, Matt. xix. 3 *εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα*, 1 Cor. xv. 53 *δεῖ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν*. Cf. Jno. iii. 4; v. 10; ix. 27; xii. 21; Acts iv. 16; Rev. ii. 21; 2 Cor. x. 12; xii. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 8; Eph. iii. 18. Under this head comes also Jno. v. 44 (*πιστεύειν* signifies *to exercise faith, to become a believer*).

c. In particular, after verbs of *hoping, promising, commanding, wishing*, and many others, the Greeks frequently employ the Inf. Aor. (Lob. Phryn. p. 751 sq.; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 153; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 50 sq.; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 525, 719; Weber, Demosth. 343, especially Schlosser, vindic. N. T. locor. adv. Marceland. Hamb. 1742, 4to. p. 20 sqq.), viz. where the action is to be designated merely as brought to pass (*"ab omni temporis definiti conditione libera et immunis,"* Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 140; Weber, Dem. as above);¹ whereas the Inf. Pres. has reference to 311 the continuance of the action, or represents it as just now occurring, 7th ed. and the Inf. Fut. (after verbs of *hoping, promising*) represents it as not to occur till some future time of indefinite remoteness (Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 215 sq.; cf. Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 138; Pflugk, Eur. Heracl. p. 54 sq.). In the N. T. *ἐλπίζω* is uniformly followed by the Inf. Aor. [since only in Acts xxvi. 7 is the Infin. Future found as the solitary variant of Cod. B], and none of the examples will occasion any difficulty, especially as it often depends upon the writer how he will view the action; as, Luke vi. 34 *παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν*, Phil. ii. 23 *τοῦτον ἐλπίζω πέμψαι, ὡς ἂν ἀπιδῶ* etc. vs. 19; 2 Jno. 12 *ἐλπίζω γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, 3 Jno. 14; Acts xxvi. 7; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Tim. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. x. 15.² Likewise *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι* is usually construed with the Inf. Aor.; as, 297 Mark xiv. 11 *ἐπηγγέλλατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι*, Acts iii. 18; vii. 5; similarly 6th ed. 348 *ἰδοὺ*, Acts ii. 30 *ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου*; on the other hand, see Inf. Fut. in

¹ It is less probable that the Inf. Aor. is intended to designate the action as rapidly passing (Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 160; Krüg. Dion. II. p. 101, and others); this element hardly comes to view in the case of a hope or a command.

² For an Inf. Perf. after *ἐλπίζω* see 2 Cor. v. 11 *ἐλπίζω καὶ ἐν ταῖς συνεδήσεσιν ὑμῶν πεφανερῶσθαι* that *I have been made manifest*, where *ἐλπίζω* is not exactly equivalent to *νομίζω*, but indicates an impression still requiring confirmation; but the Inf. Perf. after the preceding *πεφανερῶμεθα* needs no explanation. Cf. Iliad. 15, 110 *ἔδη νῦν ἔλασσε* "Ἀρτὴ γὰρ πῆμα τεύχεσθαι," appropriately quoted by Mey. Further, cf. below (no. 7, end).

χθῆτε) cf. Her. 2, 2; Xen. C. 5, 1, 21 νομίζοιμι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν εἰσέναι etc., 1, 4, 4 (where see Poppo); Anab. 7, 1, 30; Mem. 2, 6, 35; Diod. S. 1, 50; Exc. Vat. p. 57; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 12; see Krüger as above, S. 390. Yet in the former passages this construction was preferred probably for the sake of antithesis (see Plat. symp. c. 3, and Stallb. in loc., cf. Krüger as above, S. 386 f.) or of perspicuity: *I deem not that I myself have already* etc. For the same reason, also, ὑμᾶς, in Eph. as above, appears to be employed, since in vs. 21 another subject, Jesus, has intervened. Later writers, however, use this construction even when no antithesis is intended, cf. Heinichen, Euseb. H. E. I. 118.

b. After verbs of *saying*, (*asserting*), *believing*, the Inf. is sometimes used when the assertion etc. refers not to something that really *is*, but to something that *should be* (such verbs containing rather the notion of advice, claim, or command; see also Elmsley, Soph. Oed. T. p. 80; Mtth. 1230); as, Acts xxi. 21 λέγων, μὴ περιτέμνουν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα *he said they ought not to circumcise their children* (he commanded them not to circumcise etc.) xv. 24? Tit. ii. 2; Acts xxi. 4 τῷ Παύλῳ ἔλεγον μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱεροσ. *they said to Paul that he should not go up* (advised him not to go) etc. cf. Eurip. Troad. 724. In all these cases if the statement were resolved into direct address the Imperative would be used: *μὴ περιτέμνετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν*. Compare on this Inf. (which even recent writers still explain by supposing the omission of δεῖν, see in opposition Hm. Vig. 745) Lob. Phryn. p. 753 sqq.; Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 131; Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 81; Jen. Lit. Zeit. 1816. No. 231; Bhdy. 371. Too many passages, however, of the N. T. have been referred to this head. Rom. xiv. 2 δ; μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα means: *one man has confidence to eat*, and the *may* is already implied in πιστεύειν. In xv. 9 δοξάσαι denotes, not what the Gentiles should do, but what they actually do; see Fr. In ii. 21 f. and Eph. iv. 22 f. (see above) the verbs *to make known* and *to be instructed*, on which the Infinitives depend, inherently denote as well what is (and must be believed) as what ought to be (should be done); and, in the same way, we can say: *they preached to* 339 *them not to steal; ye have been taught to lay aside*. In Acts x. 22 χρηματίζεσθαι occurs, which is almost uniformly employed to denote the direction of an oracle, a divine injunction. Finally, when after verbs of *beseeching* the Inf. must be rendered by *may*, such 303 import is comprehended in the meaning of those verbs in the *3rd ed.* context in question, as in 2 Cor. x. 2 δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι

τῇ πεποιθήσει, as if, I beseech you in reference to my not being bold, that is, to see that I be not bold.¹

c. The Article is put before the Inf. when it is the object, to make it a substantive, and thus give it greater prominence (Rost 289 682) Rom. xiii. 8; xiv. 13 (Luke vii. 21 var.); 1 Cor. iv. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 1; viii. 10; Phil. iv. 10; cf. above, 1 (Hm. Soph. Aj. 114); especially at the beginning of the sentence (Thuc. 2, 53; Xenoph. M. 4, 3, 1), 1 Cor. xiv. 39 τὸ λαλεῖν γλώσσαις μὴ κωλύετε (cf. Soph. Phil. 1241 ὃς σε κωλύσει τὸ δρᾶν). In Phil. ii. 6 οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, the Inf. with the Article is the immediate object of ἡγήσ., and ἄρπαγμ. is predicate, cf. Thuc. 2, 87 οὐχὶ δικαίαν ἔχει τέκμαρσιν τὸ ἐκφοβῆναι, and Bhdy. 316.

Especially deserving of attention is the use (in Luke peculiarly frequent) of the Inf. with the Acc. after ἐγένετο, as in Mark ii. 23 ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτόν *accidit, ut transiret*, Acts xvi. 16 ἐγέν. παιδίσκην τινὰ ... ἀπαντήσαι ἡμῖν, xix. 1 ἐγέν. Παῦλον διελθόντα ... ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἔφεσον, iv. 5; ix. 3, 32, 37, 43; xi. 26; xiv. 1; xxi. 1, 5; xxii. 6; xxvii. 44; xxviii. 8, 17; Luke iii. 21 f.; vi. 1, 6; xvi. 22 etc.² Here the Infinitive clause is to be considered as the (extended) subject of ἐγένετο, just as after συνέβη (see just below), and in Latin after *aequum est*, *apertum est*, etc. (Zumpt, Gr. 505): *Jesus' passing by came to pass*, etc. The construction is good Greek, though the frequent use of ἐγένετο with the Inf., instead of the historical tense of the particular verb, is primarily an imitation of the Hebrew *וַיְהִי*. In Greek we find a grammatical parallel in συνέβη τὴν πόλιν ... εἶναι κυριεύουσιν Diod. S. 1, 50; 3, 22, 39; Plat. legg. 1, 635 a.; Demosth. Polycl. 709 c.; Dion. H. IV. 2089, and frequently, particularly in Polybius (also 2 Macc. iii. 2), which occurs also once in Acts xxi. 35. 340 The germ of the former construction may be seen in Theogn. 639 πολλάκι ... γίγνεται εὐρεῖν ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν, with which Matt. xviii. 13 agrees most closely. It appears in its full form in Plat. Phaedr. 242b. τὸ δαϊμόνιον τε καὶ τὸ εἰωθὸς σημεῖόν μοι γίγνεσθαι ἐγένετο; and especially in later writers, e.g. Codin. p. 138 ἐγένετο τὸν βασιλέα ἀθυμεῖν, Epiphan. Monach. ed. Dressel p. 16 ἐγένετο αὐτοὺς ἀναβῆναι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

The use of the Acc. with the Inf., as has been already remarked, is elsewhere in the N. T. comparatively rare. A clause with ὅτι is more

¹ In 2 Cor. ii. 7 ὅστε ... χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι the two Infinitives in the same way denote what should be, and not what actually takes place. Yet even here δεῖν is not to be supplied, but the clause with ἱκανόν extends its influence to these Infinitives: The reproach is sufficient, — that you may now, on the contrary, forgive him etc.

² The same construction is followed in Acts xxii. 17 ἐγένετό μοι ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ... γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει, where the Infin. might have been joined directly to μοι ὑποστ. (*accidit mihi*), and perhaps would have been joined to it had not the writer been led to depart from this construction by the intervention of the Gen. abs. καὶ προσευχομένου μου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.

304 common, quite after the manner of the later (popular) language, which
 7th ed. resolves condensed constructions, and prefers the more circumstantial and
 perspicuous. Hence in Latin e.g. *ut* where the more ancient language
 employed the Acc. with the Inf.; hence, especially, the *quod* after verbs
dicendi and *sentiendi* which in the period of declining Latin (particularly
 in the extra-Italian provinces) becomes more and more frequent. In Ger-
 man the concise construction, "He said I had come too late," is resolved
 in the speech of the people into "He said *that* I," etc. Moreover, it must
 290 not be overlooked that after verbs *dicendi* the N. T. likes to introduce
 6th ed. what is said in the oratio recta, according to the graphic idiom of Oriental
 tongues.

4. The Inf. rendered an unmistakable substantive by means of the Article is also employed in the oblique cases. When so used it appears in the N. T. most frequently (far more so than in Greek authors) in the Genitive. Sometimes,

a. it depends on nouns or verbs which elsewhere also govern the Genitive: 1 Cor. ix. 6 οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι; 1 Pet. iv. 17 ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα etc., Acts xiv. 9 πίστιν ἔχει τοῦ σωθῆναι, xx. 3 ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν, Luke xxiv. 25 βραδεὶς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν, Acts xxiii. 15 ἔτοιμοι τοῦ ἀνελεῖν (Sept. Ezek. xxi. 11; 1 Macc. v. 39); Luke i. 9 ἐλαχε τοῦ θυμῶσαι (1 Sam. xiv. 47); 2 Cor. i. 8 ὥστε ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν, 1 Cor. xvi. 4 εἰ ἂν ᾗ ἄξιον τοῦ κύμπε πορεύεσθαι if it be worthy of my going also. Cf. also 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Cor. viii. 11; Luke xxii. 6; Phil. iii. 21; Rom. vii. 3; xv. 23; Heb. v. 12; Rev. ix. 10 (Sept. Gen. xix. 20; Ruth ii. 10; Neh. x. 29; Judith ix. 14, etc.). Sometimes the Codd. vary between the Inf. with τοῦ and without it, as in Rev. xiv. 15 (in other passages we find, in parallel phrases, sometimes the one and sometimes the other, Heb. v. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 9). For passages from Greek authors, see Georgi, vind. 325 sq.; Mtth. 1256. (In these, several words frequently intervene between the Article and the Inf.; but this does not occur in the N. T., owing to the simplicity of its diction. See Demosth. funebr. 153 a., 154 c.; Aristocr. 431 a.)

Under this head come also Luke i. 57 ἐπλήσθη ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν, ii. 21, cf. Sept. Gen. xxv. 24; xlvii. 29, as in writing Greek the
 341 author regarded the Gen. as depending immediately on χρόνος. In Hebrew the construction is somewhat different, the Inf. with ה being used; see Ewald 621.

Sometimes, b. it is construed with entire clauses, to express *design* (see Valcken. Eurip. Hippol. 48; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 56;

Schaefer. Demosth. II. 161; V. 368; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 338; Mtth. 1256 f.), where the earlier philologists supplied *ἐνεκα* (cf. Dem. funebr. 156 b.) or *χάριν*, as Luke xxiv. 29 εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μέναι σὺν αὐτοῖς, Matt. xxiv. 45 ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν, iii. 13 παραγίνεται ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, xiii. 3; Luke ii. 27; v. 7; xxi. 22; xxii. 31; Acts iii. 2; xxvi. 18; 1 Cor. x. 13; Heb. x. 7; Gal. iii. 10; with 305 a negative in Acts xxi. 12 παρεκαλοῦμεν . . . τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτὸν ^{7th ed.} εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, Jas. v. 17; Heb. xi. 5. This construction is especially peculiar to Luke (and Paul). But in Greek prose, particularly after the time of Demosthenes, parallel instances occur; and this use of the Genitive results so surely from the primary import of the case itself (Bhdy. 174 f.), that no one should venture to find in it either an ellipsis or a Hebraism. Cf. Xen. C. 1, 6, 40 τοῦ δὲ μηδ' ἐντεῦθεν διαφεύγειν, σκοποῦς τοῦ γυγνομένου καθίστης. Plat. Gorg. 457 e. φοβούμαι οὖν διελέγχειν σε, μὴ με ὑπολάβῃς οὐ πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα φιλονεικοῦντα λέγειν, τοῦ καταφανὲς γενέσθαι etc. Strabo 15, 717; Demosth. Phorm. 603 b.; Isocr. Aegin. 932; Thuc. 291 1, 23; 2, 22; Heliod. 2, 8, 88; 1, 24, 46; Dion. H. IV. 2109; ^{8th ed.} Arrian. Al. 2, 21, 13; 3, 25, 4 and 28, 12. An Inf. with, and another without τοῦ, are connected in the same principal clause in Luke ii. 22 f. If a subject is expressed in this construction it is put in the Acc. Luke v. 7.

In Phil. iii. 10 also this Inf. denotes design, where τοῦ γνῶναι is connected with vs. 8 and resumes the thought there expressed. (In the Sept. this Inf. occurs on every page, cf. Gen. i. 14; xxiv. 21; xxxviii. 9; xliii. 17; Judg. v. 16; ix. 15, 52; x. 1; xi. 12; xv. 12; xvi. 5; xix. 3; xx. 4; Ruth i. 1, 7; ii. 15; iv. 10; Neh. i. 6; 1 Sam. ix. 13, 14; xv. 27; 2 Sam. vi. 2; xix. 11; Jonah i. 3; Joel iii. 12; Judith xv. 8; 1 Macc. iii. 20, 39, 52; v. 9, 20, 48; vi. 15, 26.)

Different from this, and more closely connected with the notion of the Genitive — hence to be referred to a. — is the use of the Inf. with τοῦ after verbs signifying to *be distant from*, to *restrain or debar from*, to *prevent from*; for these verbs contain the inherent power of directly governing the Gen., and accordingly are uniformly followed by the Gen. of a noun, as Rom. xv. 22 ἐνεκοπτόμην . . . τοῦ ἐλθεῖν, Luke iv. 42 καὶ κατέχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι (cf. Isocr. ep. 7, 1012 ἀπέχων τοῦ τινος ἀποκτείνειν, Xen. M. 2, 1, 16; A. 3, 5, 11), with a pleonastic negative 342 (§ 65) Acts xiv. 18 μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς (cf. παύειν τινά τινος and παύεσθαι followed by Inf. with τοῦ Diod. S. 3, 33; Phalar. ep. 35, αὐτὸν ἡσυχάζειν τοῦ ποιεῖν Malalas 17, p. 417), xx. 27 οὐχ ὑπεστελλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. vs. 20),

1 Pet. iii. 10 παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον, Luke xxiv. 16 οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγρῶναι αὐτόν (Xen. Laced. 4, 6), Rom. vi. 6; Acts x. 47 (Sus. 9; 3 Esr. ii. 24; v. 69, 70; Gen. xvi. 2; Act. Thom. § 19; Protev. Jac. 2 etc.). Perhaps also φεύγειν and ἐκφεύγειν τοῦ ποιῆσαι is best explained in this way (as φεύγειν τινός is used), Xen. A. 1, 3, 2. Cf. Bhdy. 356; Bttm. exc. II. ad Demosth. Mid. p. 143.

In Rom. i. 24 παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ... εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς the Inf. depends directly on the noun ἀκαθαρσ., 306 and there is nothing strange in the omission of τὴν before ἀκαθ. (xv. 23; 7th ed. 1 Cor. ix. 6). The Gen. indicates in what this ἀκαθ. consisted: commisit impuritati, quae cernebatur in etc. Fr. with more detail says: virgula post ἀκαθαρσ. collocata ante τοῦ mente repete ἀκαθαρσίαν. The need of this I cannot perceive, as ἀκαθαρσ. and ἀτιμάζ. stand close together, and the Gen. may naturally be understood of the sphere of the ἀκαθαρσ. In the same way, too, in Rom. viii. 12 the Inf. τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν is to be understood as depending on ὀφειλέτην, in conformity to the regular phrase ὀφειλέτην εἶναι τινος; see Fr. Matt. p. 844. Finally, in Luke i. 73 τοῦ δοῦναι in the same way is most naturally connected with ὄρκον, cf. Jer. xi. 5.

It soon became usual, however, to employ this construction more loosely, not only a) After verbs involving the idea of (*entreaty*)¹ 292 *command*,² *determination*, and thus indirectly of *design*, Acts xv. 20 6th ed. κρινώ ... ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι to send them the direction to abstain, Luke iv. 10 (from the Sept.) τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι, Acts xxvii. 1 (where it would be forced to connect τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν with the following παρεδίδουν), cf. Ruth ii. 9; 1 Kings i. 35; 1 Macc. i. 62; iii. 31; v. 2; ix. 69; Malal. Chron. 18, 458; Ducas p. 201, 217, 339, a.; Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 707; Vit. Epiph. p. 346; — but also, b) For epexegetis, where an Inf. with or without ὥστε might have been used, and the import of the Gen. is lost by blending result and design. Very frequently so in the Sept.; (ᾧ with the Inf. denotes both design and 843 result; as to εἰς with the Inf. see afterwards). In the N. T. compare Acts vii. 19 οὗτος κατασοφισάμενος ... ἐκάκωσε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκθετα τὰ βρέφη etc., so that they cast out (cf. Thuc. 2, 42, and Poppo in loc.), and what is still harsher iii. 12 ὡς πεποιηκόσι τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν (1 Kings xvi. 19). In both

¹ Cf. Malalas 14, 357 ἡγήσατο ἡ Αἰγυπτία τὸν βασιλέα, τοῦ κατελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους τόπους, 17, 422 πυκνῶς ἔγραφε τοῖς αὐτοῖς πατρικίοις τοῦ φροντισθῆναι τὴν πόλιν, 18, 440 κελεύσας τοῦ δοθῆναι αὐταῖς χάριν προκίς ἀνὰ χρυσίου λιτρῶν εἰκοσι etc. 18, 461.

² A construction parallel to κελεύειν ἵνα.

these passages Fr.'s exposition (Matt. p. 846) is undoubtedly to be rejected; otherwise, many passages of the Sept. would either be inexplicable, or would admit of but a very forced interpretation. Cf. in particular Josh. xxii. 26 *εἴπαμεν ποιῆσαι οὕτω τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι*, 1 Kings xiii. 16 *οὐ μὴ δύνωμαι τοῦ ἐπιστρέφειν* (1 Macc. vi. 27), xvi. 19 *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ, ὧν ἐποίησε τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν* etc., Judith xiii. 20 *ποιῆσαι σοι αὐτὰ ὁ θεὸς εἰς ὕψος αἰώνιον τοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαι σε ἐν ἀγαθοῖς*, 1 Macc. vi. 59 *στήσωμεν αὐτοῖς τοῦ πορεύεσθαι τοῖς νομίμοις*, Joel ii. 21 *ἐμεγάλυνε κύριος τοῦ ποιῆσαι*.

How diversified the use of the Inf. with τοῦ in the Sept. is, may be seen from the following passages (which can easily be classified and which exhibit more or less distinctly the relation denoted by the Genitive): Gen. xxxi. 20; xxxiv. 17; xxxvii. 18; xxxix. 10; Exod. ii. 18; vii. 14; 307 viii. 29; ix. 17; xiv. 5; Josh. xxiii. 13; Judg. ii. 17, 21, 22; viii. 1; ix. 24, 7th ed. 37; xii. 6; xvi. 6; xviii. 9; xxi. 3, 7; 1 Sam. vii. 8; xii. 23; xiv. 34; xv. 26; 1 Kings ii. 3; iii. 11; xii. 24; xv. 21; xvi. 7, 31; Ps. xxxix. 14; Jonah i. 4; iii. 4; Mal. ii. 10; 3 Esr. i. 33; iv. 41; v. 67; Judith ii. 13; v. 4; vii. 13; Ruth i. 12, 16, 18; iii. 3; iv. 4, 7, 15. See also Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 20; Tdf. in the Verhandeling. p. 141. Cf. Acta apocr. p. 68, 85, 124, 127, etc. This Infin. is by no means unfrequent in Byzantine authors; as, Malal. 18, 452; 18, 491; cf. Index to Ducas p. 639, where p. 320 even *εἰ βούλεται τοῦ εἶναι φίλος* occurs, cf. p. 189, and p. 203 *δύναται τοῦ ἀνταποκριθῆναι*. This use of τοῦ must be recognized as an extravagance of declining (Hellenistic) Greek, unless forced interpretations be preferred. In Hellenistic writers this construction appears to have become the counterpart of the Inf. with ῥ in its manifold relations; and, as generally 293 takes place in established phrases, they no longer thought of the original 6th ed. Genitive force.¹ Analogous to this, moreover, is the Byzantine usage of inserting ὥστε before the Inf. after such verbs as *βουλεύεσθαι*, *δοκεῖν* etc.; see Index to Malalas, Bonn ed.,² cf. above, no. 3.

In Rev. xii. 7 *ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ* 344 *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι* (where the received text has the correction *ἐπολέμησαν*) a construction occurs which I am unable to explain (Lücke, too, in his Einleit. in die Offenbar. Joh. 2 Aufl. S. 454 f., was unable), unless we may consider ὁ Μιχ. καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ as a parenthesis — awkward to be sure — which compelled the writer to resume then the *ἐγίν. πόλεμος* in the construction τοῦ πολεμ. Fr.'s exposition (Matt. p. 844) appears to me artificial. It would, however, be still more inadmissible to take τοῦ

¹ In Aesop. 172 de Fur. we find *ἐμελλεν αὐτὸς τοῦ καταθῆσαι ταύτην*, where Schöff. thinking solely of the above use of the Genitive Inf. (no. 4 b.) would reject the τοῦ.

² Even native Greeks could consider this Inf. after such verbs as *δύναμαι*, *θέλω* etc. as a sort of Genitive, inasmuch as the action expressed by the Inf. always depends on the principal verb as a part depends on the whole.

πολεμ. for an imitation of the (later) Hebrew פָּנֵהוּ *pugnandum* *iis erat*, as Ewald and Züllig do. For even in the Sept. that construction is in no passage rendered so strangely. If *ἐγένετο τοῦ πολεμῆσαι* alone were the reading, there would be a parallel in Acts x. 25 (see just below), and the construction would be tolerably explicable. Perhaps, however, the passage contains an ancient gloss, or something fell out of the text, at an early period, before *τοῦ πολεμ.* There is no plausibility in the proposal of Bornem. (Jen. L. Z. 1845, nr. 183) to read: *ἐγένετο πολέμιος ἐν τῷ οὐραῷ ὁ Μιχαήλ* etc.; and with Hengstenberg boldly to supply *had war* before *τοῦ πολ.* would be to make John chargeable with a strange latitude in the use of words. Acts x. 25 *ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον*, where *τοῦ* is critically established, cannot be compared to the usage mentioned by Gesen. 308 *Lehrgeb. S. 786 f.*, for according to this it must have run: *ἐγέν. ὁ Πέτρος 7th ed. τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν*; this would be an extreme use of the Inf. with *τοῦ*¹ which in Luke certainly would be very surprising. Bornem. considers the whole clause as spurious,—but the reader is referred to B. himself for the manner in which he thinks the text should be made up. Likewise in Luke xvii. 1 *ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα* some Codd. omit the *τοῦ*. If it is genuine (both Lehm. and Tdf. have retained it), the Genitive is owing probably to the notion of distance or exclusion implied in *ἀνένδεκτ.*, cf. above, no. 4 b. The view of Mey. is different.

5. The Dative of the Inf. denotes the *cause*, according to the 294 inherent import of that case, see § 31, 6 c. (Mtth. 1258; Schaef. 6th ed. Demosth. II. 163; Stallb. Plat. Tim. p. 203), 2 Cor. ii. 13 *οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν Τίτον* *because I found not* etc.; cf. Xen. C. 4, 5, 9; Demosth. pac. 21 c., funebr. 156 b., ep. 4 p. 119 b.; Achill. Tat. 5, 24; Lucian. abdic. 5; Diog. L. 10, 27; Liban. ep. 8; Athen. 9, 375; Joseph. antt. 14, 10, 1; Simplic. in Epict. enchir. c. 38, p. 385; Schweigh. Agath. 5, 16. This Inf. is understood by some as denoting *design* in 1 Thess. iii. 3 *τῷ μηδένα σαίνεισθαι ἐν 345 ταῖς θλίψεσι* *in order that no one be shaken* etc., as it were ‘for the not being shaken’ (Schott. in loc.), a thought which is subordinate to the *εἰς τὸ στηρίζαι*, and therefore was not expressed by a repetition of this form. No such Dat. Infin., however, occurs in Greek; and we must read with good Codd. [Sin. included] *τὸ μηδένα σαίνεισθαι*, which has now been received into the text. See above, 1. Remark.

6. The Infinitive in an oblique case is often joined to a *preposition*, particularly in narration, and rather more frequently in the N. T. than in Greek authors. The Article is then never omitted (Hm.

¹ Cf. Acta apocr. p. 66 *ὡς ἐγένετο τοῦ τελῆσαι αὐτοὺς διδάσκοντας* etc. Under this head would come also Acts ii. 1 if the reading were *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις τοῦ συμπληροῦσθαι*.

Vig. 702; Krü. 94),¹ though several words may be inserted between the Article and the Inf. (Acts viii. 11; Heb. xi. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 2);² as, Matt. xiii. 25 ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους *while men slept*, Gal. iv. 18; Luke i. 8; Acts viii. 6 (Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 5; Hiero 1, 6); iii. 26 εὐλογούντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν etc. *by turning away, in that he turns away* (Heb. iii. 12); Phil. i. 23 ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι *desire towards departing* (to depart), Jas. i. 19 βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι *slow to speak*, 1 Cor. x. 6 εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι 309 ὑμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν *to the end that ye be not etc.*, ix. 18; 2 Cor. 7th ed. iv. 4; vii. 3; Matt. xxvi. 2; Luke iv. 29; Acts vii. 19 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 5; An. 7, 8, 20) Rom. iv. 18 (see Philippi), 1 Thess. ii. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 6 εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον *so that we besought Titus* (lit., unto the beseeching etc.),³ Rom. vii. 5; Heb. xi. 3; Heb. ii. 15 διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν (through) *all their life-time*, Phil. i. 7 διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς *because I have you etc.*,⁴ Acts viii. 11; xviii. 2; Heb. vii. 23; x. 2; Luke ii. 4; Mark v. 4 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 5; Mem. 2, 1, 15; Aristot. rhet. 2, 13; Pol. 2, 5, 2); Jas. iv. 15 ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς *instead of your saying* (Xen. Apol. 8; Plat. 295 rep. 1, 343 a.); Matt. vi. 8 πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι *before your 6th ed. asking*, Luke ii. 21; xxii. 15; Acts xxiii. 15 (Zeph. ii. 2; Plato, Crit. 48 d.); Matt. vi. 1 πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς *in order to be seen of them*, 2 Cor. iii. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Luke xviii. 1 ἔλεγεν παραβολὴν πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι *in reference to etc.*; Matt. xxvi. 32 μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με *after my resurrection*, when I 346 shall have been raised, Luke xii. 5; Mark i. 14; Acts vii. 4; xv. 13 (Herod. 2, 9, 6; 3, 5, 10); 2 Cor. vii. 12 εἶνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴν σπουδὴν ὡμῶν (Demosth. fun. 516 a. b.; Plato, Sis. 390 b.; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 39. Also inscript. Rosett. 11).

Paul with peculiar frequency expresses purpose by the Infinitive with εἰς or πρὸς, while in such cases the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews prefers a derivative noun; see Schulz, Hebräerbr. S. 146 ff. But cf. also 1 Cor. vii. 35.

¹ On the other hand, cf. Theodoret. III. 424 ἀπὸ κυβεύειν τὸ ὄνομα, IV. 851 παρὰ συγκλῶσθαι, Psalt. Sal. 4, 9. Similar constructions sometimes occur in Greek prose (Bhdj. 354; Kühner II. 352), but it is uncertain.

² Yet not so many, and not entire clauses even, as frequently in Greek authors (Xen. Occ. 13, 6; Cyr. 4, 5, 9; 7, 5, 42 etc.). The adjuncts, too, are uniformly put *after* the Inf. An Inf. with ἄχρι or μέχρι never occurs; with ἔνεκα only once.

³ The rendering of the Inf. with εἰς by *so that* is unobjectionable, as εἰς is elsewhere employed to express alike either aim or result; cf. Eurip. Bacch. 1161.

⁴ Against the other exposition, according to which ὡμᾶς is taken as the subject, see van Hengel in loc. Even where the subject is placed *after* the Infinitive the proper construction is always to be determined by the context, e.g. Simplic. enchir. 13 p. 90 διὰ τὸ πολέμιους μμεῖσθαι τοὺς συγγυμναστὰς. Cf. Jno. i. 49.

If in this construction of the Inf. with a prep. a subject be annexed, it is put in the Acc. even when it is one and the same with the subject of the principal clause; as, Heb. vii. 24 ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ... ἔχει, Luke ii. 4. Predicates also stand then in the Acc.; as, Luke xi. 8 δώσει αὐτῷ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ φίλον; but cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 3 διὰ τὸ φιλομαθῆς εἶναι ... αὐτὸς ἀνηρώτα, Mtth. 1284. Yet the attraction, which properly accounts for the Nominative, is also in other circumstances omitted in Greek authors.

The Inf. (without the Article) after πρὶν or πρὶν ἢ (Reitz, Lucian. IV. 501 ed. Lehm.), may be considered as Inf. nominascens; e.g. Jno. iv. 49 κατὰβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου is equivalent to πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθ. etc. The Inf. with this particle is employed not only in connection with a Fut. or Imperf. in reference to a still impending fact (Mtth. 1200) Matt. xxvi. 34 310 ed. (Acts ii. 20); but also in reference to past events (Xen. C. 3, 3, 60; An. 1, 4, 13; Herod. 1, 10, 15) in connection with Preterites, Matt. i. 18; Acts vii. 2; Jno. viii. 58. As to πρὶν ἢ cf. Her. 2, 2; 4, 167.

7. The well-known distinction between the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor., as well as between the Inf. Aor. and Inf. Fut. (Hm. Vig. p. 773),¹ is for the most part very clearly observed in the N. T. The Inf. Aorist is employed,

a. In *narration* after a Preterite on which it depends (in accordance with that parity of tenses carefully observed in Greek, see Schaef. Demosth. III. 432; Stallb. Phileb. p. 86 and Phaed. p. 32); as, Mark ii. 4 μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσειν αὐτῷ ... ἀπεστέγασαν, xii. 296 12 ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, v. 3 οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι, Luke 6th ed. xviii. 13 οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπάρει, Jno. 347 vi. 21; vii. 44; Matt. i. 19; viii. 29; xiv. 23; xviii. 23; xxiii. 37; xxvi. 40; xxvii. 34; Mark vi. 19, 48; Luke vi. 48; x. 24; xv. 28; xix. 27; Acts x. 10; xvii. 3; xxv. 7; Col. i. 27; Gal. iv. 20; Philem. 14; Jude 3. This is quite regular, and requires no proof from Greek authors, Mdv. 188. (Sometimes, however, we find the Inf. Pres., as in Jno. xvi. 19; Acts xix. 33; Luke vi. 19, and in parallel passages the Inf. Pres. is used in Matt. xxiii. 37, while in Luke xiii. 34 the Inf. Aor.) Likewise the Inf. Aor. is uniformly connected with the Imp. Aor.; as, Matt. viii. 22 ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς, xiv. 28; Mark vii. 27.

¹ Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 140: Aoristus (Inf.) quia nullam facit significationem perpetuitatis et continuationis, prouti vel initium vel progressus vel finis actionis verbo expressae spectatur, ita solet usurpari, ut dicatur vel de eo, quod statim et e vestigio fit ideoque etiam certo futurum est, vel de re semel tantum eveniente, quae diuturnitatis et perpetuitatis cogitationem aut non fert aut certe non requirit, vel denique de re brevi et uno veluti temporis ictu peracta.

b. After any tense, when an action (rapidly) passing, completed at once, or instantly to begin, is to be expressed (Hm. Vig. as above); as, Mark xiv. 31 *ἐάν με δέη συναποθανεῖν σοι*, xv. 31 *ἐάντὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι*, Matt. xix. 3 *εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα*, 1 Cor. xv. 53 *δεῖ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν*. Cf. Jno. iii. 4; v. 10; ix. 27; xii. 21; Acts iv. 16; Rev. ii. 21; 2 Cor. x. 12; xii. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 8; Eph. iii. 18. Under this head comes also Jno. v. 44 (*πιστεῦεν* signifies *to exercise faith, to become a believer*).

c. In particular, after verbs of *hoping, promising, commanding, wishing*, and many others, the Greeks frequently employ the Inf. Aor. (Lob. Phryn. p. 751 sq.; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 153; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 50 sq.; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 525, 719; Weber, Demosth. 343, especially Schlosser, vindic. N. T. locor. adv. Marcelland. Hamb. 1742, 4to. p. 20 sqq.), viz. where the action is to be designated merely as brought to pass ("ab omni temporis definiti conditione libera et immunis," Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 140; Weber, Dem. as above);¹ whereas the Inf. Pres. has reference to 311 the continuance of the action, or represents it as just now occurring,^{7th ed.} and the Inf. Fut. (after verbs of *hoping, promising*) represents it as not to occur till some future time of indefinite remoteness (Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 215 sq.; cf. Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 138; Pflugk, Eur. Heracl. p. 54 sq.). In the N. T. *ἐλπίζω* is uniformly followed by the Inf. Aor. [since only in Acts xxvi. 7 is the Infin. Future found as the solitary variant of Cod. B], and none of the examples will occasion any difficulty, especially as it often depends upon the writer how he will view the action; as, Luke vi. 34 *παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν*, Phil. ii. 23 *τοῦτον ἐλπίζω πέμψαι, ὡς ἂν ἀπιδῶ* etc. vs. 19; 2 Jno. 12 *ἐλπίζω γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, 3 Jno. 14; Acts xxvi. 7; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Tim. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. x. 15.² Likewise *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι* is usually construed with the Inf. Aor.; as, 297 Mark xiv. 11 *ἐπηγγείλατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι*, Acts iii. 18; vii. 5; similarly 348 *ἰδοὺ*, Acts ii. 30 *ὅρκῳ ὅμοσεν αὐτῷ ὅ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὁσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσει ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου*; on the other hand, see Inf. Fut. in

¹ It is less probable that the Inf. Aor. is intended to designate the action as rapidly passing (*Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 160; Krüg. Dion. H. p. 101, and others*); this element hardly comes to view in the case of a hope or a command.

² For an Inf. Perf. after *ἐλπίζω* see 2 Cor. v. 11 *ἐλπίζω καὶ ἐν ταῖς συνειδήσεσιν ὑμῶν πεφανερῶσθαι* that *I have been made manifest*, where *ἐλπίζω* is not exactly equivalent to *νομίζω*, but indicates an impression still requiring confirmation; but the Inf. Perf. after the preceding *πεφανερῶμεθα* needs no explanation. Cf. *Iliad* 15, 110 *ἥδη νῦν ἔλπομ' Ἀργεῖ γε πῆμα τετάρχθαι*, appropriately quoted by *Mey*. Further, cf. below (no. 7, end).

Heb. iii. 18 ; Weber, Demosth. 330. After *κελεύειν* the Inf. Aor. is more frequent than the Inf. Pres., the latter being used for the most part in reference to a continued action ; as, Acts xvi. 22 *ἐκέλευον ῥαβδίζειν*, xxiii. 35 *ἐκέλευσε αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ φυλάσσεσθαι*, xxiii. 3 ; xxv. 21 etc. *Παρακαλεῖν* has the Inf. Aor. in Rom. xii. 1 ; xv. 30 ; 2 Cor. ii. 8 ; Eph. iv. 1, etc. ; but the Inf. Pres. in Rom. xvi. 17 ; 1 Thess. iv. 10 ; 1 Tim. ii. 1.

This explains also the use of the Inf. Aor. after *ἐτοίμος* and *ἐν ἐτοιμίᾳ ἔχειν* (in reference to the future), as in 2 Cor. x. 6 ; xii. 14 ; 1 Pet. i. 5 ; Acts xxi. 13, which is more frequent than the Inf. Pres. The former is on the whole rare in Greek authors ; yet cf. Dion. H. III. 1536 (Joseph. antt. 12, 4, 2 ; 6, 9, 2). In the N. T. *πρὶν* also is uniformly used with the Inf. Aor. ; and when *πρὶν* refers to the future, the Inf. Aor. has the meaning of the Fut. exact. See Hm. Eurip. Med. p. 343.

Whether in the N. T. the Inf. Aor. ever has the force of a Preterite, except in the use considered in 7 a., is questionable. In Rom. xv. 9 *τὰ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν* this might seem at first to be the case, as the Inf. depends on *λέγω* vs. 8 (Mdv. S. 187) and corresponds to 312 a Perfect *γενήσθαι*, while Paul would certainly have expressed continuous 7th ed. glorifying by a Present. Probably, however, he merely wished to express the act of glorifying without reference to time at all. Likewise in 2 Cor. vi. 1 it is not necessary to take *δέξασθαι* as a Preterite, as even Mey. does [yet not in the later editions], though the connection which Fr. Rom. III. 241 suggests between vi. 1 and v. 20 is somewhat far-fetched. Probably in later Greek the Inf. Perf. quite superseded the Inf. Aor. in such cases, as being more expressive ; see p. 334 below, no. 7, end.

The Inf. Present is generally employed to express an action just taking place, or (in itself or its results) continuing, or frequently repeated ; as, Jno. ix. 4 *ἐμὲ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με*, vii. 17 *ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῆν*, xvi. 12 *οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι*, iii. 30 ; Acts xvi. 21 ; xix. 33 ; Gal. vi. 13 ; 1 Cor. xv. 25 ; 1 Tim. ii. 8 ; Tit. i. 11 ; Phil. i. 12. Hence it is used in general maxims ; as, Luke xvi. 13 *οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίως 349 δουλεύειν*, Mark ii. 19 ; Acts v. 29 ; Matt. xii. 2, 10 ; Jas. iii. 10, etc. Verbs of *believing*, are construed with the Inf. Pres. to express something which already exists or at least has already commenced (Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 91) ; as in 1 Cor. vii. 36 ; Phil. i. 17 (16). See Ast, Plat. legg. p. 204. As to *κελεύειν* with the Inf. Pres. see above.

If this distinction is not always rigorously observed where it might be expected, this may be explained by the circumstance that in many cases it depends entirely on the writer whether he

will represent an action as continuing, or as transient and occupy- 298
 ing only a point of the past (cf. Luke xix. 5; Matt. xxii. 17); and ^{6th ed.}
 by the fact that some writers are negligent in such matters. Hence
 in parallel passages we sometimes find the Inf. Aor. and Inf. Pres.
 employed in the same relation; as, Matt. xxiv. 24 cf. Mark xiii. 22;
 Matt. xiii. 3 cf. Luke viii. 5, also Jude 3. The like occurs even
 in the better Greek authors; as, Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 1 εἴ τι τοῦ βασιλέως
 δέουσι, τοὺς παῖδας ἐκέλευον τοῦ Κύρου δεῖσθαι διαπράξασθαι
 σφίσι· ὁ δὲ Κύρος, εἰ δέουσι αὐτοῦ οἱ παῖδες, περὶ παντός ἐποιεῖτο
 διαπράττεσθαι, 6, 1, 45 ἣν ἐμὲ ἐάσης πέμψαι, 46 ἐκέλευσε
 πέμπειν, 2, 4, 10 οὓς ἂν τις βούληται ἀγαθοὺς συνεργοὺς ποιεῖσθαι
 ... οὓς δὲ δὴ τῶν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἔργων ποιήσασθαι τις βούλοιο
 συνεργοὺς προθύμους (cf. Porpo in loc.), Demosth. Timocr. 466 a.
 μὴ ἐξεῖναι λῦσαι μηδὲνα (νόμον), ἐὰν μὴ ἐν νομοθέταις, τότε δ' ἐξεῖναι
 τῷ βουλομένῳ ... λύειν. Cf. also Arrian. Al. 5, 2, 6. We find
 a perceptible distinction, however, between the Inf. Pres. and the
 Inf. Aor. in parallel clauses e.g. in Xen. C. 5, 1, 2, 3; Mem. 1, 1,
 14; Her. 6, 177 etc., see Mith. 944; Weber, Demosth. 195, 492.
 In the N. T. cf. Matt. xiv. 22 ἠνάγκασε τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι εἰς
 τὸ πλοῖον (quickly passing action) καὶ προάγειν (continued)
 αὐτόν etc. Luke xiv. 30; Phil. i. 21. See in general Maetzner, 313
 Antiphon p. 153 sq. ^{7th ed.}

It appears, on the whole, that where the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor. may
 be used indiscriminately, the latter is the more common (as being the less
 definite), particularly after ἔχω *possum* (Hm. Eur. suppl. p. 12 praef.), δύναμαι,
 δυνατός εἰμι, θέλω, etc. In the Codd. of Greek authors the Inf. Pres. and
 Inf. Aor. are not unfrequently interchanged, see Xen. C. 2, 2, 13; Arrian.
 Al. 4, 6, 1; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 904, 941, etc. So likewise in the N. T.,
 cf. Jno. x. 21; Acts xvi. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 35; 1 Thess. ii. 12.

The preceding remarks will also account for the use of the Inf. Aor. after
 hypothetical clauses, as in Jno. xxi. 25 ἄτινα, ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἑν, οὐδὲ αὐτὸν
 οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι *non comprehensurum esse*, where some unneces- 350
 sarily would insert ἂν; cf. Isocr. Trapez. 862; Demosth. Timoth. 702 a.;
 Thuc. 7, 28; Plat. Protag. 316 c. (in some of which cases, it is true, εἰ
 with the Opt. precedes). The expression is more confident (without ἂν),
 see Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 43; cf. Lösner, obs. p. 162 sq. The Inf. Fut.
 (that is, also without ἂν, cf. Hm. partic. ἂν p. 187) is not singular in such
 constructions, Isocr. ep. 3 p. 984.

As to the construction of μέλλειν, in particular, with the Inf., that verb
 in Greek authors is most frequently used with the Inf. Fut. (cf. also
 Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 206 sq.), more rarely with the Inf. Pres. (cf. Dion.
 H. IV. 2226, 8; Arrian. Al. 1, 20, 13; 5, 21, 1, and Krüger, Dion. p. 498).

This, however, is not very surprising as the notion of futurity is already implied in μέλλειν, and the construction is analogous to that of ἐλπίζειν. It is still more rarely used with the Inf. Aor. (Plat. apol. 30 b.; Isocr. Callim. p. 908; Thuc. 5, 98; Paus. 8, 28, 3; Ael. 3, 27). This last construction, indeed, some ancient grammarians (e.g. Phrynich. p. 336) pronounce to be un-Greek, or rather un-Attic; but they have been thoroughly
 299 confuted with a considerable number of undoubted examples by Böckh, 6th ed. Pind. Olymp. 8, 32; Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. p. 117; Bremi, Lys. p. 745 ff., cf. also Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 149. In the N. T. we most frequently find after μέλλειν, a. the Inf. Pres. (in the Gospels always); only in a few passages, b. the Inf. Aor., and that mostly in reference to transient actions, as in Rev. iii. 2 μέλλει ἀποθανεῖν, iii. 16 μ. ἐμέσαι, xii. 4 μ. τεκεῖν, Gal. iii. 23 τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, cf. Rom. viii. 18 (but 1 Pet. v. 1); c. more rarely the Inf. Fut., viz. in Acts xi. 28 λιμὸν μέγαν μέλλειν ἔσθθαι, xxiv. 15 ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσθθαι νεκρῶν, xxvii. 10 (xxiv. 25).

The Perfect Inf. is frequently employed, especially in narration, to denote a past event in its relation to present time; as, Acts xvi. 27 ἔμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν, νομίζων ἐκπεφευγέναι τοὺς δεσμίους *had fled*, and accordingly were away, xxvii. 13 δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι *they had* (already) *obtained their purpose* (and were thus in possession of the advantages), viii. 11; xxvii. 9; xxvi. 32; Heb. xi. 3; Rom. iv. 1; xv. 8, 19; Mark v. 4; Jno. 314 xii. 18, 29; 2 Tim. ii. 18 (1 Pet. iv. 3) 2 Pet. ii. 21. In several 7th ed. of these passages, after verbs of *saying, supposing, thinking*, a Greek author would perhaps have considered the Inf. Aorist as sufficient, Mdv. 187. On. 2 Cor. v. 11 see p. 331 note ²; as to 1 Tim. vi. 17 see § 40, 4 a. p. 273.

8. That the N. T. writers sometimes (see below, p. 338 sq.) use ἵνα where, according to the syntax of (the written) Greek prose, simply the Inf. (Pres. or Aor., not the Perf.) should be expected, was 251 correctly admitted by the earlier biblical philologists, but has been resolutely denied by Fr. (exc. I. ad Matt., yet see Rom. III. 230), whom Mey., and almost nobody else hitherto, has followed.¹ In such phrases as the following, Matt. iv. 3 εἰπέ, ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι ἄρτοι γένωνται, xvi. 20 διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ εἰπωσιν etc., and particularly Mark v. 10 παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλά, ἵνα μὴ αὐτοὺς ἀποστείλῃ etc., the original meaning of ἵνα might indeed be retained, and the phrases rendered: *speak* (a word of power), *to the*

¹ On the other hand, Tittmann, Synon. II. 46 sqq., Wahl (also in the Clav. apocryph. p. 272), and Bretschneider agree with me in the view for which I contend. Besides, compare Robinson, a Greek and English Lexicon of the N. T. (New York, 1850. 8vo.) p. 352 sq.

end that these stones become bread; he charged his disciples, to the end that they should tell no man; he besought him much, to the end that he would not send them away. Still, it would be strange, in the first place, that in so many passages, instead of the object of the entreaty or of the command, which was to be expected, the design should be stated, which in such connections usually merges itself in the object. Again, the possibility of the foregoing interpretation shows merely how close the affinity is in such a case between the design and the object, and how easily therefore *ἵνα* might have come to be employed to denote the latter. It is accordingly much simpler to believe that the later language, in accordance with its genius, resolved the more condensed construction with the Inf. into a separate clause and to some extent weakened the import of *ἵνα*,¹ just as the Romans employed their *ut* after *impero*, *persuadeo*, *rogo*, inasmuch as the object of the command, request etc. is always something to be accomplished, and therefore the purpose of the person commanding or beseeching.² Traces of this use of *ἵνα* already occur in writers of the κοινή. That is to say, in these writers,

a. "*ἵνα* after verbs of *desiring* and *beseeching* already begins to pass over into a *that* of the objective clause³; as in Dion. H. I. 215 δεήσεσθαι τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς σῆς ἐμελλόν, ἵνα με πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀγάγοι, II. 666 sq. κραυγὴ ... ἐγένετο καὶ δεήσεις ... ἵνα μένη etc., Charit. 3, 1 παρεκάλει Καλλιρρόην ἵνα αὐτῷ προσέλθῃ, Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 27 (see Schaef. Melet. p. 121). In the Hellenistic writers this use is quite common; as, 2 Macc. ii. 8; Sir. xxxvii. 15; xxxviii. 14; 3 Esr. iv. 46; Joseph. antt. 12, 3, 2; 14, 9, 4; Ignat. Philad. p. 379; Cod. pseudepigr. I. 543, 671, 673, 730; II. 705; Act. Thom. 10, 24, 26; Acta apocr. p. 36.⁴ As to *ἵνα* after verbs of *commanding*

¹ Weakened, because originally *ἵνα* was employed only where a direct design was to be expressed: *I come, in order to help thee*. Even *worthy to be kept* the earlier writers express not by *ἵνα* (Matt. viii. 8; Jno. i. 27; vi. 7, etc.), but by the Inf., perhaps with *ἵνα* (Mith. 1238). But it does not follow that the weakened *ἵνα* yet coincides altogether with *ἵνα*. It appears rather to be for the most part still recognizable as an extension of *eo consilio ut*. Hence there is no inconsistency in maintaining the above rule on one page, and on the next denying that *ἵνα* is to be considered as equivalent to *ἵνα* (see § 53, 10).

² Those who vehemently combat this view should at least confess that the use of *ἵνα* in the cases mentioned is not in accordance with the (older) prose diction of the Greeks. This is the least requirement of grammatical fairness.

³ A solitary instance in the earlier authors (Demosth. cor. 335 b.) is ἀξιούν ἵνα.

⁴ In the Acts Luke has never employed this construction, but after ἐρωτᾶν and παρακαλεῖν always uses the Inf., see viii. 31; xi. 23; xvi. 39; xix. 31; xxvii. 33. In the Gospel also he has in v. 3 the Inf. with ἐρωτᾶν, which occurs also in Jno. iv. 40; 1 Thess. v. 12. Matthew usually connects παρακαλεῖν with the direct words of the individual entreating.

and *directing*,¹ see Hm. Orph. p. 814; cf. Leo Philos. (in epigrammat. gr. libb. 7, Fref. 1600, fol. p. 3) εἰπέ κασιγνήτη κρατεροὺς ἵνα θήρας ἐγείρῃ, Malal. 3 p. 64; Basilic. I. 147, κελεύειν and θεσπίζειν ἵνα (3 Esr. vi. 21; Malal. 10 p. 264), ἐπιτρέπειν ἵνα Malal. 10 p. 264, διδάσκειν ἵνα Acta Petri et Pauli 7.² Accordingly in the N. T. also we may cease to insist on the strict force of ἵνα, and may render it in the following passages simply by *that*, just as in Latin praecipe, rogavit, imploravit *ut* etc.: Luke x. 40 εἰπὼν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται (iv. 3; Mark iii. 9; Jno. xi. 57; xiii. 34; xv. 17), 2 Cor. xii. 8 τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσα ἵνα ἀποστῇ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ (Mark v. 18; viii. 22; Luke viii. 31; 1 Cor. i. 10; xvi. 12; 2 Cor. ix. 5), Mark 301 vii. 26 ἡρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαίμ. ἐκβάλῃ (Jno. iv. 47; xvii. 15; Luke 6th ed. vii. 36), Luke ix. 40 ἐδεήθην τῶν μαθητῶν σου ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν (xxii. 32), Phil. i. 9 προσεύχομαι ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν . . . περισσεύῃ, b. Moreover, θέλειν ἵνα also simply means: *will (wish) that*,³ cf. 316 Arrian. Ep. 1, 18, 14; Macar. hom. 32, 11; Cod. pseudepigr. I. 704; 7th ed. Thilo, Apocr. I. 546, 684, 706; Tdf. in the Verhandl. p. 141. If Matt. vii. 12 ὅσα ἂν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν means, *wish with the design that they do*, one cannot understand why θέλειν ἵνα did not become a common construction in the language, since θέλειν may 353 be always so taken. And ought Mark vi. 25 θέλω ἵνα μοι δῶς τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου to be rendered: *I will in order that thou give me?* What is the proper object of choice here? Is it not the obtaining of John's head? Why then that circumlocution? And how affected it would be to render Mark ix. 30 οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνῶ, *he would not, in order that any one should know!* That nobody should know was precisely his object of choice. Cf. also Acts xxvii. 42 βουλὴ ἐγένετο, ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνωσι, Jno. ix. 22 συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα . . . ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται, xii. 10

¹ In the N. T. κελεύειν is never construed with ἵνα.

² An analogous construction is the Inf. with τοῦ after verbs of *beseeching, exhorting, commanding*, as in Malal. 17, 422 πυκνῶς ἔγραφε τοῖς αὐτοῖς πατρικίοις τοῦ φροντισθῆναι τὴν πόλιν, 18, 440 κελεύσας τοῦ δοθῆναι αὐταῖς χάριν προικὸς ἀνὰ χρυσίου λιτρῶν εἰκοσι etc., 461 ἦρθε πᾶς ὁ δῆμος τοῦ ἀχθῆναι πάνθημον, p. 172. Index to Ducas in the Bonn ed. p. 639 sq.

³ Hence the modern Greek circumlocution for the Inf.: θέλω νὰ γράφω or γράψω, for γράφειν, γράψαι. In general how far modern Greek goes in its application of the particle νὰ — which occurs even in the Byzantine writers, e.g. Cananus (cf. also *Boissopade*, Anecd. IV. 367) — a few passages from the Orthodox Confession will show: p. 20 (ed. *Normann*) πρέπει νὰ πιστεύωμεν (p. 24, 30), p. 36 λέγεται νὰ κατοικῇ, p. 43 ἐφοβεῖτο νὰ δουλεῖ (scrupled cf. Matt. i. 20), p. 113 ἡμπορεῖ νὰ δεχθῇ, p. 211 θέλει, ἐπιθυμᾷ νὰ ἀποκτήσῃ, p. 235 ἔχουσι χρέος νὰ νοουθετοῦσι, p. 244 εἰμεσθαι χρεωφειλέται νὰ ἀπογένηται. In the above passages, therefore, the modern Greek translator has almost always retained the ἵνα in the form νὰ.

(Sir. xliv. 18), and, as an isolated instance of the commencement of such construction among the Greeks, Teles in Stob. serm. 95 p. 524, 40 ἵνα Ζεὺς γένηται ἐπιθυμήσει. Under this head comes also ποιεῖν ἵνα in Jno. xi. 37; Col. iv. 16; Rev. iii. 9 (analogous to ποιεῖν τοῦ with Inf., see above, no. 4) and δίδοναι ἵνα in Mark x. 37; see Krebs in loc. Lastly,

c. In Matt. x. 25 ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, does the interpretation *satis sit discipulo non superare magistrum, ut ei possit par esse redditus* seem easy and agreeable? Cf. Jno. i. 27; vi. 7; Matt. viii. 8 (Inf. Matt. iii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Luke xv. 19, etc.). In John iv. 34 ἐμὸν βρώμά ἐστιν, ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με does the use of ἵνα seem to be completely justified by the translation *meus victus hoc continetur studio, ut Dei satisfaciam voluntati*? In that case σπουδάζειν ἵνα must have been the ordinary and most natural construction. That in Jno. xv. 8 the clause with ἵνα cannot express the design with which God glorifies himself (Mey.), has already been shown by Lücke; cf. also xvii. 3. To resolve also Matt. xviii. 6 συμφέρει αὐτῷ, ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνικὸς . . . καὶ καταποντισθῇ etc. into συμ. αὐτῷ κρεμασθῆναι μύλον ὄν. . . ἵνα καταποντ. etc. (by an attraction), would, I greatly fear, be generally thought very forced. And Meyer's opinion is too manifestly a shift. See also Luke xvii. 2; 302 xi. 50; Jno. xvi. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 2, 3; Phil. ii. 2; likewise Luke 6th ed. i. 43 πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου etc.,¹ on which passage Hm. partic. ἄν p. 135 remarks: 'fuit haec labantis linguae quaedam incuria, ut pro infinitivo ista constructione uteretur. In fact, in all these phrases every unprejudiced scholar must perceive that the clause with ἵνα contains what, in classical Greek, would have been expressed by the simple Inf. (Mtth. 1235), just as in Latin (especially of the silver age) *aequum est ut, mos est ut, expedit ut* was employed, where the mere Inf. (as subject) would have been sufficient, see Zumpt S. 522. Sometimes the construction 317 with ἵνα and that with the Inf. are found connected, as in 1 Cor. 7th ed. ix. 15 καλὸν γάρ μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν, ἢ τὸ καύχημά μου ἵνα τις 354 κενώσῃ, where it is easy to perceive what led the apostle to alter the construction; yet in this passage the ἵνα is not fully established. Thus the traces of the ancient function of the particle of design still exhibited in the examples adduced under a., and even under b. also, have entirely disappeared in the passages last illus-

¹ Analogous is Arrian. Epictet. 1, 10, 8 πρῶτον ἐστιν, ἵνα ἐγὼ κοιμηθῶ. Cf. besides, Acta apocr. p. 8, 15, 29.

trated. And so we see how modern Greek, gradually extending the usage, forms *every* Infin. by means of *νά*. How far popular Greek had already declined in the second century, appears from many parts of Phryn., and in particular p. 15 sq. Lobeck's ed.

What Wytttenbach, Plutarch. Mor. I. 409 Lips. (p. 517 Oxon.), has adduced from Greek authors to prove the alleged lax use of *ἵνα* for *ὥστε*, is not all to the point. In *πείθειν ἵνα* (Plut. apophth. 183 a.) the verb is not regarded as supplemented by the clause with *ἵνα* (by persuasion to effect *that*), but as independent: to speak persuasively *in order that*. *Τί μοι τοιοῦτο συνέγκως, ἵνα τοιαύταις με κολακεύσῃς ἡδοναῖς* (Plut. fort. Alex. p. 333 a.) means: *what hast thou discerned in me of the kind in order to flatter?* that is, concisely: what could lead you to flatter me? In Adv. Colot. p. 1115 a. (240 ed. Tauchn.) *ποῦ τῆς ἀουκίῃ τοῦ βιβλίου ἔγραφεν, ἵνα . . . μὴ τοῖς ἐκείνου συντάγμασιν ἐντύχῃς*, what was properly but result is attributed to the writer as *design*; so we too say: In what desert then did he write his book, to keep you from obtaining it? In Liban. decl. 17 p. 472 *οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν οἰκέτης πονηρός, ἵνα κριθῇ τῆς Μακεδόνων δουλείας ἕξιος* no slave is bad, in order to be judged worthy, — *ἵνα* is not used for *ὥς* after an intensive (so bad as to be), but denotes the design which the slaves' *πονηρία* might have occasioned see § 53, 10, p. 461. These passages are not exactly parallel to the above constructions from the N. T., but they exhibit the gradual transition to them. The phrase *ὅρα ὅπως* does not come under this head, and the *ὅπως* also after verbs of *beseeching, commanding, etc.* (Matt. viii. 34; ix. 38; Luke vii. 3; x. 2; xi. 37; Acts xxv. 3; Philem. 6, etc.), which is not uncommon in Greek authors (Schaeff. Demosth. III. 416; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 439; Holwerda, emendatt. Flav. p. 96 sq.), 803 is usually otherwise explained, Mtth. 1231; Rost S. 648. Yet see Tittmann, Synon. II. 59.

Further, John's use of *ἵνα* (cf. Lücke I. 603, II. 632 f., 667 f.) deserves special attention; in particular where *ἵνα* refers complementally to a demonstrative pronoun. Two cases are to be distinguished:

- 855 a. 1 Jno. iii. 11 *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν* *that we should love*, vs. 23, cf. vi. 40. Here the telic force of *ἵνα* is clearly discernible (in the manner stated above p. 334 sq.), as in iv. 34 *ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντος* *that I may do* (strive to do), vi. 29. In these passages nobody will consider *ἵνα* as equivalent to *ὅτι*. On the other hand, b. Jno. xv. 8 *ἐν τούτῳ ἔδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολλὸν φέρῃτε* is certainly equivalent to the construction with the Inf. (*ἐν τῷ καρπὸν πολλὸν 318 φέρειν ὑμῶς*). The same applies to xvii. 3 *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, ἵνα 7th ed. γινώσκωσιν etc.*,¹ xv. 13; 1 Jno. iv. 17; 3 Jno. 4; like Luke i. 43 *πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ for τὸ ἐλθεῖν τὴν μ.* see p. 337. To these may be added the

¹ Schweigh. is wrong in adducing in his Lexic. Epictet. p. 356 the passage from Arrian. Epict. 2, 1, 1 as an instance of *this* construction.

phrase *χρεῖαν ἔχειν ἵνα* Jno. ii. 25; xvi. 30; 1 Jno. ii. 27 (Ev. apocr. p. 111) as well as Jno. xviii. 39. On the other hand, viii. 56 *ἡγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ* is not *he rejoiced in order to see*; yet still less is it *that (ὅτι) he saw*, but *that he should see*;—a thought which, although *ἵνα* implies the idea of purpose (design), could hardly have been expressed in Greek by means of *ἵνα* alone. In Jno. xi. 15 *ἵνα* is simply a particle of design.

Finally, the construction *ἔρχεται* or *ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἵνα δοξασθῇ* xii. 23; xiii. 1; xvi. 2, 32 means: *the time is come in order to*, that is, the time appointed for the purpose, that etc. True, in a Greek author in the same sense the Inf. *ἐλήλ. ἡ ὥρα (τοῦ) δοξασθῆναι*, perhaps *ὥστε* *δοξ.*, would have been employed.¹ Cf. Ev. apocr. p. 127.

As to Rom. ix. 6 *οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, where a clause with *ὅτι* seems to be used as a periphrasis for the Inf., see § 64, I. 6.

Note 1. It sometimes appears as if the Inf. Act. were used for the Inf. Pass. (d'Orville, Charit. p. 526) e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 9 *περὶ τῆς φιλαδελφίας οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε γράφειν ὑμῖν* (Heb. v. 12), but v. 1 *οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι*; cf. also Heb. vi. 6. Both constructions, however, are equally proper, (Active, *ye have no need to write to you*, that is, that I (one) write to you; as if: *ye have no need of one's writing etc.*). In such connections the Inf. Act. is perhaps even more frequent in classical Greek; see Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. p. 151 Lips.; Jacobs, Philostr. Imagg. 620, also as respects *χρῆ* and *δεῖ* in particular, Weber, Demosth. 306. Cf. especially Theodoret. II. 1528; IV. 566.

Note 2. *Ὅτι* occurs with the Inf. in Acts xxvii. 10 *θεωρῶ ὅτι μετὰ πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τ. φορτίου καὶ τ. πλοίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῖν* (cf. Xen. Hell. 2, 2, 2 *εἰδώς, ὅτι, ὅσῳ ἂν πλείους συλλεγώσιν* 304 *ἐς τὸ ἄστυ, θάπτον τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἔνδειαν ἔσεσθαι*, Cyr. 1, 6, 18; 2, 4, 15; 6th ed. An. 3, 1, 9; Plato, Phaed. 63 c.; Thuc. 4, 37), which is a blending of two constructions (Hm. Vig. 500): *μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῖν* and *ὅτι μέλλει ἔσεσθαι ὁ πλοῖς*. So especially after verbs *sciendi* and *dicendi*, Schaeff. ad Bast. ep. crit. p. 36; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 479; Wyttenb. Plutarch. Moral. I. 54; Boissonade, Philostr. 284 and Aen. Gaz. p. 230; Fritzsche, quæst. Lucian. p. 172 sq. This so frequently occurs in the best authors (even in short sentences, Arrian. Al. 6, 26, 10), that it almost ceased to be felt by the Greeks as an anacoluthon, and to the *ὅτι* may be attributed merely a *vis monstrandi*, as when it introduces the oratio directa, cf. Klotz, Devar. 319 p. 692. (Similarly *ἵνα* with the Inf. 3 Esr. vi. 31.) 7. ed.

Note 3. A trace of the Hebrew Inf. Absol. presents itself from the Sept. in Matt. xv. 4 *θανάτῳ τελευτάτω* (Exod. xix. 12; Num. xxvi. 65), and in the diction of the N. T. itself in Rev. ii. 23 *ἀποκτενῶ ἐν θανάτῳ* (cf. *מָתָה יָמָה*), and Luke xxii. 15 *ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα* etc. So frequently in the

¹ The Subjunctive excludes the possibility of taking *ἵνα* in these cases for *where* (*Ποῦθεν*. partic. I. 525 sq.); as, otherwise, it would be necessary to regard the Subj. Aor. as exactly equivalent to the Fut. (*Λοβ. Phryn.* 723). Yet see *Tittmann*, Synon. II. 49 sq.

Sept. the Inf. Absol. is expressed by the Ablative of a *nomen conjugat.* annexed to a verb, in a manner not altogether foreign to the Greek idiom (§ 54, 3), as in Gen. xl. 15; xliii. 2; l. 24; Exod. iii. 16; xi. 1; xviii. 18; xxi. 20; xxii. 16; xxiii. 24; Lev. xix. 20; Num. xxii. 30; Deut. xxiv. 15; Zeph. i. 2; Ruth ii. 11; Judith vi. 4 (test. patr. p. 634). See, in general, Thiersch p. 169 sq. How in still other passages the Sept. expresses the Inf. Absol., see below, § 45, 8, p. 354.

Note 4. There is nothing singular in a concurrence of several Infinitives in a single sentence, one depending on another, somewhat as in 2 Pet. i. 15 *σπουδάσω ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς . . . τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*. In Greek authors three Infinitives not unfrequently occur thus in immediate succession; Weber, Demosth. 351.

§ 45. THE PARTICIPLE.

1. The verbal character of the Participle appears, partly in its directly governing the same case as its verb (Luke ix. 16 *λαβὼν τοὺς ἄρτους*, 1 Cor. xv. 57 *τῷ δίδοντι ἡμῖν τὸ νίκος*, Luke viii. 3 *ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς*, 2 Cor. i. 23 *φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἦλθον*, 1 Cor. vii. 31; Heb. ii. 3; Luke xxi. 4; ix. 32, etc.); partly in its regularly retaining the element of *time*, which can be done more
357 completely in Greek than in Latin and German on account of its copiousness in participial forms. The temporal force of the participles corresponds, moreover, to the observations made in § 40 upon the separate tenses.

The simple and ordinary use of the Participle is exemplified,

a. of the Present, in Acts xx. 23 *τὸ πνεῦμα διαμαρτύρεται μοι λέγον* etc., Rom. viii. 24 *ἐλπίς βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς*, 1 Thess. ii. 4 *θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας*, 1 Pet. i. 7 *χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου*, Heb. vii. 8 — something now present or uniformly occurring at all times (Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 153; Schaef. Plut. V. 211 sq.).

b. of the Aorist, in Col. ii. 12 *τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος Χριστὸν*
305 *ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, Rom. v. 16 *δι' ἐνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος* (something that
occurred once by itself), Acts ix. 21.

c. of the Perfect, in Acts xxii. 3 *ἀνὴρ γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ, ἀνατετραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ* (past facts still operative), Jno. xix. 35 *ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν*, Matt. xxvii. 37 *ἐπέθηκαν . . . τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην*, Acts xxiii. 3; 1 Pet. i. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 6; Jno. v. 10; vii. 15; Eph. iii. 18.

d. of the Future (rare in the N. T.) in 1 Cor. xv. 37 *οὐ τὸ σῶμα*
820 *τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις*, viewed from the past, Heb. iii. 5 *Μωϋσῆς*

πιστὸς . . . ὡς θεράπων εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων *of those things which were to be spoken* (revealed); cf. Acts viii. 27; xxiv. 11; Luke xxii. 49.

Moreover, the Present Participle is used a) for the Imperf. in connection with a past tense; as, Acts xxv. 3 *παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν αἰτούμενοι χάριν*, Rev. xv. 1 *εἶδον ἄγγέλους ἐπὶ τὰ ἔχοντας πληγὰς*, Heb. xi. 21 *Ἰακώβ ἀποθνήσκων . . . ἠυλόγησεν*, Acts vii. 26 *ᾤφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένοις*, xviii. 5; xx. 9; xxi. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 23; 2 Cor. iii. 7 (Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 264); also of a continued state of things, Acts xix. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 5. b) of that which will immediately or infallibly occur; as, Matt. xxvi. 28 *τὸ αἷμα τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*, vi. 30 *τὸν χόρτον αὐρίου εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον*, 1 Cor. xv. 57; Jas. v. 1. Accordingly, ὁ ἐρχόμενος used of the Messiah, κϣη, is not *venturus*, but *he that cometh* (the coming one), he of whom it is firmly believed that he is coming, Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19, etc.

Likewise ὢν, joined to a Preterite or an adverb of time, is not unfrequently an Imperfect Participle; as, Jno. i. 49; v. 13; xi. 31, 49; xxi. 11; Acts vii. 2; xi. 1; xviii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 28; 2 C. viii. 9; Eph. ii. 13 *νυνὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες* etc. Col. i. 21; 1 Tim. i. 13 *μὲ τὸ πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον*. Cf. Aristot. rhet. 2, 10, 13, *πρὸς τοὺς μυριστὸν ὄντας*, Lucian. dial. mar. 13, 2 *ὅψε ζηλοτυπεῖς ὑπερόπτης πρότερον ὢν*. But in Jno. iii. 13 ὢν (see Lücke and BCrus. in loc.) means: *who* (essentially) *is in heaven, who belongs to heaven*.¹ The same applies to i. 18. But ix. 25 *ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω* is probably: *I being blind* (from my infancy), *a blind man*; only in so far as a reference to a previous condition is included in ἄρτι, can it perhaps also be translated, *whereas I was*. An undoubted Present occurs in 1 Cor. ix. 19 *ἐλεύθερος ὢν ἐκ πάντων πᾶσιν ἑμαυτὸν ἐδούλωσα* *being free* (though I am free), I made myself servant (the Apostle's *ἐλευθερία* was something permanent). On the other hand, in Rev. vii. 2 *εἶδον . . . ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα* (which Eichhorn strangely enough declared to be a solecism) *I saw him ascend* (while he was ascending) an Imperf. Part. is quite appropriate, as denoting something not at the moment completed. But in xiv. 13 *ἀποθνήσκοντες* can only be the Present Part.

In many passages formerly the Present Part. was improperly taken for the Future, in most of which the force of the Present is quite sufficient: 306 in connection, 611 ed.

¹ Ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρ., in the signification of *qui erat in coelo*, would nearly coincide in sense with ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. καταβάς. It must here, however, denote something special and more emphatic, and a climax in these predicates is not to be overlooked. Yet ὁ ὢν does not form a third predicate co-ordinate with the two others, but is, as Lücke correctly observes, explanatory of the predicate ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ.

a. with a Pres. or Imperat., as Rom. xv. 25 πορεύομαι διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις (the διακονεῖν begins simultaneously with the journey), 1 Pet. i. 9 ἀγαλλῆσθε . . . κομιζόμενοι *as receiving* (they are so already in the assurance of faith), Jas. ii. 9. As to 2 Pet. ii. 9 see Huther.

b. with an Aor. (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 234), as 2 Pet. ii. 4 παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους *as those who are kept* (contemplated from a present point of view), Acts xxi. 2 εὐρόντες πλοῖον διαπερῶν εἰς Φοινίκην on her passage to, *bound for* (Xen. Eph. 3, 6 in.), Luke ii. 45 ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσ. ἀναζητοῦντες αὐτόν *seeking him* (which began already on the way back), Mark viii. 11; x. 2 (Fut. Part. in reference to an action only purposed, Acts xxiv. 17; xxv. 13).

c. with a Perf., as Acts xv. 27 ἀπεστάλακμεν Ἰουδαν καὶ Σίλαν . . . ἀπαγγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτὰ ἀννουκείν, *with the announcement* (they assumed the character of announcers simultaneously with their entrance on their journey), 1 Cor. ii. 1; Demosth. Dionys. 739 c.; Pol. 28, 10, 7. In 2 Pet. iii. 11 τούτων πάντων λυομένων means, *since all these things are dissolving*, that is, are by their nature destined for dissolution; the doom of dissolution is already as it were inherent in them. Λυθησομένων would express only mere futurity: as their dissolution will at some time take place. The Apostolic (Pauline) terms οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, οἱ σωζόμενοι (subst.) denote: 359 *those who are perishing, those who are becoming saved* etc., not merely at some future time but already, inasmuch as they refused to believe and therefore are the prey of eternal death. As to Acts xxi. 3, see no. 5.

d. with a Conjunct. exhortat., as Heb. xiii. 13 ἐξερχώμεθα . . . τὸν ὄνειδισμόν αὐτοῦ φέροντες, where the bearing etc. is annexed directly to the ἐξέρχ., whereas the Fut. Part. would have removed it to some indefinite and distant time. Cf. also 1 Cor. iv. 14.

Still less can the Pres. Part. take the place of the Aorist. In 2 Cor. x. 14 οὐ γὰρ ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι εἰς ὑμᾶς ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτοὺς means: *as though we reached not unto you* (which, however, is the case). In 2 Pet. ii. 18 ἀποφεύγοντας, which Lehm. has already adopted, denotes that the escaping has only just begun; such persons are most liable to be misled. As to Eph. ii. 21 and iv. 22, see Meyer.

The Aorist Part., in the course of a narration, expresses either a simultaneous action (Krü. 155), Acts i. 24 προσευξάμενοι εἶπον *praying they said* (the prayer follows), Rom. iv. 20; Eph. i. 9; Col. ii. 13; Phil. ii. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 5; or a previously past action, where we should expect the Plup., Matt. xxii. 25 ὁ πρῶτος γαμήσας ἐτελεύτησε, Acts v. 10; xiii. 51; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Eph. i. 4 f.; ii. 16. If the principal verb refers to something future, the Aor. Part. is equivalent to the Latin Fut. exact.; as, 1 Pet. ii. 12 ἵνα . . . ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύσαντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεόν, iii. 2; Eph. iv. 25 ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν, Mark xiii. 13; Acts xxiv. 25;

Rom. xv. 28; Heb. iv. 3; Hm. Vig. 774. Likewise the Perf. Part. has sometimes in narration the sense of a Plup.; as, Jno. ii. 9 οἱ διάκονοι ἤδειςαν οἱ ἡντληκότες, Acts xviii. 2 εὐρῶν Ἰουδαίων ... προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τ. Ἰταλίας, Heb. ii. 9; Rev. ix. 1.

The Aor. Part. never stands for the Fut. Part.:—not in Jno. xi. 2 (where the Evangelist alludes to an event long past, which he narrates for the first time in chap. xii.); also not in Heb. ii. 10, where ἀγαγόντα 307 refers to Christ sojourning in the flesh, who even while on earth led many ^{6th ed.} to glory (a work which began with his very appearance). As to Heb. 322 ix. 12 see below, 6. It is a misuse of parallel passages to translate Mark xvi. 2 ἀνατελειαντος τοῦ ἡλίου: as *the sun rose* (so Ebrard still), because Jno. xx. 1, cf. Luke xxiv. 1, has σκοτίας ἐτι οὐσης. Such minute discrepancies in the gospels one must have the courage to tolerate. As to Jno. vi. 33, 50 ἄρτος ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, compared with ἄρτος ὁ καταβάς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in verses 41, 51, see Lücke. Neither is the Aor. Part. used for the Perf. Part. in 1 Pet. i. 13.

The Perf. Pass. Part. κατεγνωσμένος in Gal. ii. 11 is erroneously rendered 360 *reprehendendus*. According to grammar and the context it means *blamed*, see Mey. Likewise in Rev. xxi. 8 ἐβδελυγμένος is *abominated*. On the other hand, in Heb. xii. 18 the Pres. Part. ψηλαφόμενον denotes *touchable*, for what *is touched* has the property of touchableness, as τὰ βλεπόμενα means *things visible*. Cf. Kritz, Sallust. II. 401 sq.

Aor. and Perf. Participles are connected and the distinction between them maintained: 2 Cor. xii. 21 τῶν προσημαρτηκότων κ. μὴ μετανοησάντων, 1 Pet. ii. 10 οἱ οὐκ ἡλεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεθéntες (Sept.)—the former denoting a state, the latter a fact. As to 1 Jno. v. 18 see Lücke; cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 129. The connection of the Pres. Part. and the Aor., as in Jno. xxi. 24; Heb. vi. 7, 10, or of the Perf. Part. and the Pres., as in Col. ii. 7, in a single proposition, hardly requires to be mentioned.

2. As respects grammatical construction, the Participle is used either a. as a complement to the principal clause, as in Matt. xix. 22 ἀπῆλθεν λιπούμενος (Rost 701); or b. it forms for the sake of periodic compactness a secondary clause, and can be resolved by a relative or by a conjunction (Rost 703; Mtth. 1311 ff.), Jno. xv. 2 πᾶν κλῆμα μὴ φέρον καρπὸν *which does not bear fruit*, Rom. xvi. 1 συνίστημι Φοίβην, οὖσαν διάκονον, Luke xvi. 14 etc.; Rom. ii. 27 ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα *if it* (thereby, that it) *fulfils*, Acts v. 4 οὐχὶ μένον σοὶ ἔμεινε; *when it remained* (unsold), did it not remain thine? Rom. vii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 4 (Xen. M. 1, 4, 14; 2, 3, 9; Plat. Symp. 208 d.; Schaef. Melet. p. 57; Mtth. 1314), Acts iv. 21 ἀπέλυσαν αὐτοὺς μηδὲν εὐρίσκοντες etc. *because they found nothing*, 1 Cor. xi. 29; Heb. vi. 6 (Jude 5;

Jas. ii. 25), Xen. M. 1, 2, 22; Lucian. dial. m. 27, 8; Rom. i. 32 οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες οὐ μόνον etc. *though they knew* etc. (had become well aware), 1 Cor. ix. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 6; Jas. iii. 4 etc.; cf. Xen. M. 3, 10, 13; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 25; Lucian. dial. m. 26, 1. Most frequently in narration the Participle is to be resolved by a particle of time; as, 2 Pet. ii. 5 ὄγδοον Νῶε . . . ἐφύλαξεν, κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἐπάξας, *as* (when) he brought upon the world, Luke ii. 45 μὴ εὐρόντες ὑπέστρεψαν *after* they had not found, Phil. ii. 19; Acts iv. 18 καλέσαντες αὐτοὺς παρήγγειλαν, Matt. ii. 3; Acts xxi. 28 ἐπέβαλον ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας κράζοντες *while* they cried etc., Rom. iv. 20 ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ etc.

361 When Participles are used limitatively (*although*), this import is often
308 indicated by καίτοι or καίπερ prefixed, as in Phil. iii. 4; Heb. iv. 3; v. 8;
6th ed. vii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 12; cf. Xen. C. 4, 5, 32; Plat. Protag. 318 b.; Diod. S.
323 3, 7; 17, 39. Sometimes this meaning is made prominent by an antithetical
7th ed. ὁμως (Krü. 202), 1 Cor. xiv. 7 ὁμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν δίδοντα . . . ἐὰν διαστολὴν
μὴ δῶ, πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον etc. *things without life, although*
giving out sound, *will nevertheless* not be understood, unless etc.

3. The connecting of two or more Participles in different relations (co-ordinate or subordinate one to another) without the copula καί with one and the same principal verb, is particularly frequent in the narrative style. This takes place not only,

a. When one Participle *precedes*, and another *follows*, the finite verb, as Luke iv. 35 ῥίψαν αὐτὸ τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς μέσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν *throwing him down* (after he had thrown him down), *the evil spirit came out of him without doing him any harm*, x. 30; Acts xiv. 19; xv. 24; xvi. 23; Mark vi. 2; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Tit. ii. 12 f.; Heb. vi. 6; x. 12 f.; 2 Pet. ii. 19 (Lucian. Philops. 24, and Peregr. 25); but more frequently,

b. When the Participles immediately follow one another without a copula, as Matt. xxviii. 2 ἄγγελος κυρίου καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον etc., Acts v. 5 ἀκούων Ἀνανίας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, πεσὼν ἐξέψυξε, Luke ix. 16 λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους . . . , ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν, 1 Cor. xi. 4 πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων, καταισχύνει etc. *every man that prayeth or prophesieth with his head covered* etc., Luke vii. 37 f.; xvi. 23; xxiii. 48; Acts xiv. 14; xxi. 2; xxv. 6; Mark i. 41; v. 25–27; viii. 6; Col. i. 3 f. εὐχαριστοῦμεν . . . προσευχόμενοι . . . ἀκούσαντες *while we pray, . . . since* (after) *we heard*, 1 Thess. i. 2 f.; Heb. i. 3; xi. 7; xii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 58; Jno. xiii. 1 f.; Col.

ii. 13; Phil. ii. 7; Philem. 4; Jude 20, etc. Nothing is more frequent in Greek authors, cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 6, 8; Cyr. 4, 6, 4; Plato, rep. 2, 366 a.; Gorg. 471 b.; Strabo 3, 165; Lucian. asin. 18; Alex. 19; Xen. Eph. 3, 5; Alciph. 3, 43 in.; Arrian. Al. 3, 30, 7; see Heindorf, Plat. Protag. p. 562; Hm. Eurip. Io p. 842; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. § 32, and Plat. Euthyphr. p. 27; Apol. p. 46 sq.; Boisson. Aristaenet. p. 257; Jacob ad Lucian. Tox. p. 43; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 322, etc. (In several passages sometimes a smaller and sometimes a greater number of Codd. have the copula *καί*, as in Acts ix. 40; Mark xiv. 22, etc.)

The Participles stand otherwise related to each other in Luke ii. 12 *εὐρήσατε βρέφος ἐσπαργανωμένον κείμενον ἐν φάτῃ ye shall find a child 362 swaddled, lying in a manger*, where the first Part. takes the place of an adjective.

4. When the Participle is employed merely as a complement or predicate, it fills sometimes the office discharged in Latin and German by the Inf. (Rost 694 ff.), viz. in the well-known phrases:

a. Acts v. 42 *οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες* (xiii. 10; Heb. x. 2; Rev. iv. 8), Acts xii. 16 *ἐπέμενε κρούων*, Luke vii. 45 (2 Macc. v. 27), 2 Pet. i. 19 *ὃ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες*, Acts x. 33; xv. 29; Phil. iv. 14; 3 Jno. 6 (Plato, symp. 174 e.; Phaed. 60 c.; Her. 5, 24, 26), 309 2 Pet. ii. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 13; b. Mark xvi. 5 *εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον*, 6th ed. Acts ii. 11 *ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν*, vii. 12; Mark xiv. 58. Logi- 324 cally, the Participle is in these instances as appropriate, at least, 7th ed. as the Infinitive; the Greeks used the former to mark a nice distinction which other nations failed to note. *Οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες* is, *teaching* (or, as teachers) *they did not cease*; ¹ *εἶδον καθήμενον* *they saw him (as one) sitting*. The Part. denotes an action or a state already existing, not first occasioned or produced by the principal verb; see, in general, Mtth. 1228; Krü. 191 ff.²

We further specify the following instances as of less frequent occurrence: Under a. 1 Cor. xiv. 18 *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶν* (rec.)³ *that I speak* (as one ...

¹ It would make no essential difference to regard this use of the Part. in the nominative, with *G. T. A. Krüger* (Untersuch. aus dem Gebiete der lat. Sprachl. III. 356 ff., 404 ff.), as attraction. Further, cf. *Hm. emend. rat.* p. 146 f.

² More precise distinctions on this head as to Greek are laid down by *Weller*, *Bemerkungen zur gr. Syntax*. Meiningen, 1845. 4to.

³ *Lchm.* and *Tdf.* on the authority of many uncial Codd. [Sin. also] give *λαλῶ*; then we have two unconnected clauses side by side: *I thank God, I speak more than you all* (for that *I speak more than you all*), cf. *Bornem. Xen. conv.* p. 71. The Cod. Alex. omits both *λαλῶν* and *λαλῶ*.

- speaking), cf. Her. 9, 79; Acts xvi. 34 ἡγαλλιάσατο πεπιστευκῶς τῷ θεῷ (Eurip. Hipp. 8; Soph. Phil. 882; Lucian. paras. 3; fug. 12; Dion. H. IV. 2238); but Rom. vii. 13 does not come under this head, see Rück. cf. Heusing. Plut. paedag. p. 19; Under b. Luke viii. 46 ἐγὼ ἔγνω δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν (Thuc. 1, 25 γνόντες . . . οὐδεμίαν σφίσιν ἀπὸ Κερκύρας τιμωρίαν οὔσαν, Xen. C. 1, 4, 7, see Monk, Eurip. Hipp. 304 and Alcest. 152),¹ Heb. 363 xiii. 23 γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον γε κποι that . . . is set at liberty, Acts xxiv. 10 ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ὄντα σε κριτὴν τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ ἐπιστάμενος, cf. Demosth. ep. 4 p. 123 etc. (but in Luke iv. 41 ἤδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, where also in Greek prose the Participle would probably have been employed, cf. Mehlhorn in Allg. L. Z. 1833, no. 110, yet see Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 580), 2 Jno. 7 οἱ μὴ ὁμολογούντες Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, 1 Jno. iv. 2 πνεῦμα δὲ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα.² As to verbs *dicendi* with a Part. see Mth. 1289; 310 Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 109. In Greek prose the verb αἰσχύνεσθαι 6th ed. also is especially so used, e.g. Xen. C. 3, 2, 16 αἰσχυνοίμεθ' ἂν σοι 325 7th ed. μὴ ἀποδιδόντες, 5, 1, 21 αἰσχύνομαι λέγων, Mem. 2, 6, 39; Diog. L. 6, 8; Liban. oratt. p. 525 b. Yet just here we see with what propriety the Participle is chosen in the cases just noted. For this verb is also construed in Greek authors with the Inf. But there is an essential difference between the two constructions; see Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 286 sq.³ The Part. is used only when a person is now doing (or has done) something of which he (at the moment of acting) is ashamed; but the Inf., when shame in view of something to be done (but not yet actually performed) is to be expressed (cf. e.g. Isocr. ad Philipp. p. 224, and big. p. 842; Xen. M. 3, 7, 5). Luke, observing this distinction, has written correctly xvi. 3 ἐπατεῖν αἰσχύνομαι to beg I am ashamed (Sir. iv. 26; Sus. 11); had the speaker already begun to beg, ἐπατῶν αἰσχύνομαι must have been used. Ἀρχομαι is uniformly in the N. T., and commonly in Greek authors, construed with the Infin., as *he began speaking* is less appropriate than *he continued speaking*. Yet see Rost 698.

¹ Eph. iii. 19 γνῶναι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ cannot be referred to this head, as many expositors refer it; for the Part., by its position between the article and substantive, is too clearly marked as an adjective. For another reason, also, Phil. ii. 28 ἴνα ἰδόντες αὐτὸν πάλιν χαρῇτε must not be referred to the above construction. The sense is: *that ye, beholding him, may again rejoice*.

² The passage of Isocr. Paneg. c. 8, usually adduced as a parallel (even still by Mth. 1289), was corrected by Hier. Wolf, cf. Baiter in loc. Weber, Demosth. p. 278, discusses another matter.

³ With πυνθάνομαι both constructions coincide; see Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 145.

Ἀκούειν, which also is occasionally construed with a predicative Part., and that not merely in the literal sense of immediate hearing as in Rev. v. 13; Acts ii. 11, but also in that of *learning, being informed* (through others) as in Luke iv. 23; Acts vii. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 11 ἀκούμεν τινος περιπατούντας etc., 3 Jno. 4 (Xen. C. 2, 4, 12),¹ is in the latter sense frequently construed with *ὅτι*, once [by Paul] with the Acc. with the Inf., 1 Cor. xi. 18 ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν (ὑπάρχοντα), [once also by John, xii. 18 ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον]; cf. Xen. C. 1, 3, 1; 4, 16. The construction is different in Eph. iv. 22 if ἀποθέσθαι ἡμῶς ... τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον depends on ἠκούσατε or ἐδιδάχθητε in vs. 21 (*that ye must put off*); see § 44, 3, p. 322.

The use of the Part. examined in this section is in Greek authors, even prose writers, much more diversified than in the N. T. (see Jacobs, Anthol. III. 235, and Achill. Tat. p. 828; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 500; Schaef. Eurip. Hec. p. 31). The construction of *πανεσθαι* with the Inf. is disapproved even by ancient grammarians, though erroneously, see Schaef. Apoll. Rhod. II. 223; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 223 sq.

Also in 1 Tim. v. 13 ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσι περιερχόμεναι the Part. is by nearly all recent expositors thought to be used for the Inf.: *they learn* (accustom themselves) (*to be*) *going about idle* etc. This gives a suitable meaning. But in all cases where the Part. joined to *μανθάνειν* refers to the subject, that verb signifies to *perceive, comprehend, observe, remark* something which is already existing, as in Hier. 3, 1 διαβεβλημένος ὑπὸ Ἀμάσιος οὐ μανθάνεις (see Valcken. in loc.), Soph. Antig. 532; Aesch. Prom. 62; Thuc. 6, 59; Plut. paed. 8, 12; Dion. II. IV. 2238; Lucian. 326 dial. d. 16, 2;² but in the sense of *learn* it is used with the Inf., Phil. iv. 11 7th ed. also 1 Tim. v. 4;³ Mtth. 1228. The preceding construction, then, must 311 6th ed. have been incorrectly extended beyond the proper bounds. Perhaps, however, *μανθ.* is to be connected with *ἀργαί*, and *περιερχόμεναι* to be taken as a proper Part. (they learn idleness, going about etc.). Ἀργαί μ. would then be a concise expression, like what sometimes occurs elsewhere also with an adjective (Plat. Euthyd. 276 b. εἰ ἀμαθεῖς ἄρι σοφοὶ μανθάνουσιν, and more frequently διδάσκειν τινὰ σοφόν), which does not like the Part. include the notion of tense or mood.⁴ This exposition, which Beza, Piscator, and others adopted and which Luther has recently approved, is supported by this, that in the sequel ἀργαί is repeated as the leading word, and to the climax φλόαροι καὶ περίεργοι a Part. is likewise annexed, λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα.⁵

¹ Cf. Rost, in his griech. Wörterb. I. 143.

² In Xen. C. 6, 2, 29 ἕως ἂν μάθωμεν ὑδροπόται γινόμενοι (a passage which would not be altogether decisive), λάθωμεν was long ago substituted for μάθωμεν.

³ Matthies has passed over the grammatical difficulty in silence. Leo, after Casaubon. ad Athen. p. 452, would render *μανθάνουσι* by *solent*; but he has not observed that this meaning belongs only to the Preterite.

⁴ Under this head comes also Dio Chr. 55, 558 δ Σωκράτης ὅτι μὲν πᾶς ὢν ἐμάνθανε λιθοξόος τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς τέχνην, ἀκηκόαμεν (Socrates learned as stone-cutter etc.).

A verb of the kind specified under a. is once construed with an Adjective — which cannot be thought strange, Acts xxvii. 33 *τεσσαρεςκαιδεκάτην 365 σήμερον ἡμέραν προσδοκῶντες, ἄσιτοι (ὄντες) διατελεῖτε*, cf. Xen. C. 1, 5, 10 *ἀναγώνιστος διατελεῖ*, Hell. 2, 3, 25.

Some erroneously think the Part. used for the Inf. in 1 Tim. i. 12 *πιστὸν με ἡγήσατο θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν*. The meaning is: *he counted me faithful, in that he appointed me to the ministry* (by that very act showing that he counted me faithful). In another sense, indeed, *θέσθαι εἰς διακονίαν* might also have been employed.

5. Present participles are frequently used (in the narrative style) with the verb *εἶναι*, and in particular with *ἦν* or *ἦσαν* (yet also with the Fut.): — sometimes, as it seems, simply for the corresponding person of their finite verb (Aristot. metaph. 4, 7; Bhdy. 334),¹ as in Mark xiii. 25 *οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται πίπτοντες* (where immediately follows, as a parallel clause, *καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται*, — Matt. has *πεσοῦνται*), Jas. i. 17 *πᾶν δῶρημα τέλειον ἄνωθέν ἐστι καταβαῖνον* etc., Luke v. 1; Acts ii. 2; sometimes, and indeed more frequently, to express continuance (rather a state than an act),² which might also be indicated, though less sensibly in reference to the past, by the form of the Imperfect³ (cf. Beza ad Matt. vii. 29), as Mark xv. 43 *ἦν προσ- 327 ἔλθων δεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ* (Luke xxiii. 51), Acts viii. 28 *ἦν 312 τε ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος αὐτοῦ* (an Imperf. immediately follows), i. 10; ii. 42; viii. 13; x. 24; Matt. vii. 29; 6th ed. Mark ix. 4; xiv. 54; Luke iv. 31; v. 10; vi. 12; xxiv. 13. Hence this construction is used especially where there is a reference to some other circumstance, as in Luke xxiv. 32 *ἡ καρδιά ἡμῶν καωμένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν ὡς ἐλάλει* etc., or to what is customary, as in Mark ii. 18 *ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου . . . νηστεύοντες* (they used to fast), to which exposition Mey. without reason objects. Also in Luke xxi. 24 *Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν* duration seems intended to be expressed, while the two Futures preceding, *πεσοῦνται* and *αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται*, denote transient occurrences, cf. Matt. xxiv. 9. In other passages *εἶναι* is not the mere auxiliary verb: Mark x. 32 *ἦσαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσ.* *they were to be on the road* (cf. vs. 17), *going up to Jerusalem* (Lucian.

¹ In some tenses (as the Perf. and Plup. Pass. Plur.) this circumlocution, as is well known, has become predominant and figures in the paradigm of the verb.

² What Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 34 says of the distinction between this construction and the finite verb amounts to this.

³ It is a characteristic of popular diction to expand concise expressions for the sake of greater clearness or force; see § 44, 3, p. 324.

dial. mar. 6, 2), v. 5, 11 (Hm. Soph. Philoct. p. 219) ii. 6; Luke 366 ii. 8; xxiv. 53; Mark xiv. 4 ἡσάν τινας ἀγανακτοῦντες *there were some* (present) *who had indignation*; or the Part. has assumed rather the nature of an adjective, as in Matt. xix. 22 ἦν ἔχων κτήματα *he was possessed of property*, ix. 36; Luke i. 20 (cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 34). Perhaps also the verbal idea was sometimes dissected into a Part. and Subst. verb in order to give it in the form of a noun more prominence (Mdv. 204), 2 Cor. v. 19 (see Mey.), 1 Cor. xiv. 9; Col. ii. 23. In Luke vii. 8 ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος the Part. appears to be not directly dependent on εἶναι, but an epithet belonging to a substantive. In Jno. i. 9 ἦν ... ἐρχόμενον are not to be taken together, but ἐρχόμενον belongs as an attributive to ἄνθρωπον, see Meyer. Moreover, this use of the Pres. Part. is not uncommon in Greek authors; and they (particularly Herodot.) employ thus the other Participles also besides the Pres., cf. Eurip. Herc. fur. 312 sq. εἰ μὲν σθενόντων τῶν ἐμῶν βραχίονων ἦν τις σ' ὑβρίζων, Her. 3, 99 ἀπαρνεόμενός ἐστιν, Xen. An. 2, 2, 13 ἦν ἡ στατηγία οὐδὲν ἄλλο δυναμένη, Herod. 1, 3, 12 κρατήσας ἦν τοῖς ὅπλοις (where προσηγάγετο precedes), Lucian. eunuch. 2 δικάσται ψηφοφοροῦντες ἦσαν οἱ ἄριστοι. See Reiz, Lucian. VI. 537 Lehm.; Couriers, Lucian. asin. p. 219; Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 12; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 597; Boisson. Philostr. 660, and Nicet. p. 81; Mtth. 1302. In later writers (e.g. Agath. 126, 7; 135, 5; 175, 14; 279, 7 etc., Ephraem. see Index under εἶναι) and in the Sept. it occurs much more frequently, though in the Sept. the Hebrew seldom gave occasion to this construction. On the other hand, the circumlocution of the Part. and *to be* for the finite verb became established, as is well known, in Aramaean; and so in Palestinian authors a national predilection 328 for the above construction may have prevailed. 7th ed.

Acts xxi. 3 ἐκεῖσε ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον cannot be rendered, with Grotius, Valckenaer and others: *eo navis merces expositura erat*, but means: *thither the vessel was unlading its cargo* i.e. in the narrative style: *thither it was going in order to unload*, (to take ἐκεῖσε for ἐκεῖ — cf. Bornem. Schol. p. 176 — is unnecessary). That the phrase ἦν ἀποφ. refers to what the ship was just then freighted with is not to be 313 overlooked. 6th ed.

In Luke iii. 23 ἦν ... ἀρχόμενος are not to be joined together, but ἦν ἐτῶν τριάκοντα forms the principal predicate, and ἀρχόμενος is annexed as a closer limitation. The idiom mentioned in Vig. p. 355 is not similar. Of one who is entering on his thirtieth year it cannot be said: *he is beginning thirty years*; he is, rather, on the point of terminating thirty years.

367 In Jas. iii. 15 οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἀνωθεν κατερχομένη ἀλλ' ἐπέγειος, ψυχικὴ etc. the Part. is employed adjectively, and ἔστιν belongs likewise to the adjectives following; cf. Franke, Demosth. p. 42.

Ἵπάρχειν with the Part. in Acts viii. 16 μόνον βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπάρχον ἐς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, is not a mere circumlocution for the finite verb, for βεβαπτ. ἦσαν would be the regular expression, there being no other form for the Plup. In Jas. ii. 15 λειπόμενοι is annexed as a predicate to γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν. In part, however, Luke xxiii. 12 προὔπῃρχον ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες might be referred to this head, for which πρότερον ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ἦσαν might have been used. See as to these combinations of ὑπάρχειν with the Part. ὦν, Bornem. Schol. p. 143.

Γίνομαι also (in the sense of εἶναι) is never in the N. T. employed with a Part. (Heind. Plat. Soph. 273 sq.; Lob. Soph. Aj. v. 588) to form a periphrasis of this sort. In Heb. v. 12 γεγόνατε χρεῖαν ἔχοντες signifies: *ye have come to have need*. In Mark ix. 3 τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένοντο στίλβοντα means: *became shining*. In the same way are to be explained Luke xxiv. 37; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Rev. xvi. 10; but in Mark i. 4 ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης (exstitit Joannes) is to be taken by itself, and the Participles that follow are added as explanatory. Just so Jno. i. 6.

The construction in the following passages cannot by any means be taken as a circumlocution for a finite verb: θεὸς ἔστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν etc. Phil. ii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 4, etc. (usually with the omission of the copula, Rom. viii. 33; Heb. iii. 4, etc.) *it is God that worketh* etc., cf. Fr. Rom. II. 212 sq.; Krü. 191.

6. Greek prose authors seldom take the liberty of omitting the Subs. verb in such constructions, so as to make the Part. stand exactly for a finite verb;¹ and then it is done only in simple tense
329 and mood forms (see Hm. Vig. 776; Mtth. 1303; Siebelis, Pausan.
7th ed. III. 106; Wannowski, synt. anom. 202 sq.).² Expositors, disregarding the corrections of Greek philologists (Hm. Vig. 770, 776 sq.; Bremi in the Philol. Beitr. a. d. Schweiz. I. 172 ff.; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 146 and Schol. in Luc. p. 183; Döderlein, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 593 sq.; Bhdý. 470), have often and unhesitatingly assumed such a usage in the N. T. But in nearly all the passages so explained,
314 a finite verb either precedes or follows, to which the Part. is to be
6th ed. joined (and then merely the usual punctuation of the text must not be minded); or there is an anacoluthon, owing to the writer's

¹ Cf. Fr. Rom. I. 282. As to the Byzantine use of Participles simply for finite verbs, see Index to Malalas, in the Bonn ed. p. 797. (We are not speaking here of the poets; see e.g. Hm. review of Müller's Eumenid. S. 23.)

² The restriction under which Mehlhorn in the Allg. Lit. Z. 1833. no. 78 maintains this ellipsis, can neither be fully justified on philosophic grounds, nor can instances be found, especially in later authors, to support it.

having lost sight of the construction with which he began (Poppo, Thuc. III. III. 138). Several such passages have been correctly explained by Ostermann in Crenii exercitatt. II. 522 sq.

a. In 2 Cor. iv. 13 *ἔχοντες* must be joined to the *πιστεύομεν* following: *as we have ... we also believe*. In 2 Pet. ii. 1 both *ἀρνούμενοι* and *ἐπάγοντες* are to be connected with *παρεισάξουσιν*; they are not, however, co-ordinate with each other, but *ἐπάγοντες* is annexed to the clause *οὔτινες ... ἀρνούμενοι*. In Rom. v. 11 *ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι* has not so close a correspondence to *σωθησόμεθα*, that *καυχώμεθα* (var.) was to have been expected; but the meaning appears to be *but not only shall we be saved* (simply and actually), but while we, so that we etc. (expressive of the joyous consciousness of the saved). In 2 Cor. viii. 20 *στελλόμενοι* is to be connected, as to the sense, with *συνεπέμφαμεν* in vs. 18. In Heb. vi. 8 *ἐκφέρουσα* does not stand for *ἐκφέρει*, but this Part. corresponds to *πιούσα* and *τίκτουσα* in vs. 7, and by *δέ* is placed in opposition to both; but an *ἐστί* is to be supplied with *ἀδόκιμος* and *κατάρas ἐγγύς*. In 2 Pet. iii. 5 *συνεστῶσα* is a proper Part. (attributive), and the preceding *ἦσαν* avails also for *ἡ γῆ*. In Heb. vii. 2 *ἐρμηνεύόμενος* must be joined to *Μελχισ.* in vs. 1., as *ὁ συναντ.* and *ὃ ἐμέρισεν* are parenthetical clauses, and the principal verb in the sentence follows all the predicates in vs. 3 *μένει ἱερεύς* etc. In Eph. v. 21 *ὑποτασσόμενοι*, like the other Participles in vss. 19, 20, certainly belongs with the principal verb *πληροῦσθε ἐν πν.*, and is not to be taken for an Imperative, as has been done by Koppe, Flatt, and others; the *αἱ γυναῖκες* etc. in vs. 22 is then joined, without a special verb (for *ὑποτάσσεσθε* is undoubtedly a gloss), to *ὑποτασσόμενοι*, as a further illustration. Likewise in 1 Pet. v. 7 the Participles are connected with the foregoing Imperative in vs. 6; and 1 Pet. iii. 1 refers back to ii. 18, where the Part. is to be joined to the Imperat. in vs. 17. In the same way in 2 Thess. iii. 8 *ἐργαζόμενοι* is to be joined to *ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ*, and this again corresponds to *δωρεάν* as an adjunct to the verb *ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν*. In Heb. x. 8 *λέγων* belongs to the verb following in vs. 9, *εἵρηκεν*. In x. 16 *διδούς* may very well be connected with *διαθήσομαι*. Rom. vii. 13 has long since been correctly explained. 1 Pet. iv. 8 needs no explanation.

b. Acts xxiv. 5 begins with the Part. *εὑρόντες τὸν ἄνδρα*, and vs. 6 should have continued *ἐκρατήσαμεν αὐτόν* etc.; instead of this the writer annexes this principal verb to the interposed relative clause *ὃς καὶ ... ἐπέiraσε*. In 2 Pet. i. 17 *λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ*

etc. the structure is interrupted by the parenthetical clauses *φωνῆς* ... *εὐδόκησα*; and the apostle continues in vs. 18 with *καὶ ταύτην* 369 *τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἤκούσαμεν*, instead of saying, as he intended, *ἡμᾶς εἶχε ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούσαντας*, or something similar (Fr. diss. 315 in 2 Cor. II. 44).¹ In 2 Cor. v. 6 *θαρρόντες*, after several interme- 64 ed. diate clauses, is resumed in *θαρρόμεν* δέ vs. 8. In vii. 5 *οὐδεμίαν ἐσχκεν ἄνεσιν ἢ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἔξωθεν μάχαι* etc., *ἤμεθα* (from *ἢ σὰρξ ἡμῶν*) may be supplied (Hm. Vig. p. 770); but an anacoluthon may also be assumed (Fr. as above, p. 49), as if Paul had written in the previous part of the sentence *οὐδεμίαν ἄνεσιν ἐσχέκαμεν τῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν*. In v. 12 *ἀφορμὴν διδόντες* must be taken as a Part., but the foregoing clause must be understood as if it had run *οὐ γὰρ γράφομεν ταῦτα πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνοντες*, or, what comes to the same thing, the more general *λέγομεν, γράφομεν*, be deduced from *συνιστάνομεν*; see Mey. in loc. In 1 Pet. ii. 11 *ἀπέχεσθε* is the reading now adopted, with which in vs. 12 *ἔχοντες* is regularly connected; and in Acts xxvi. 20 *ἀπήγγελλον* was long ago substituted for *ἀπαγγέλλων*. As to Rom. xii. 6 ff.; Heb. viii. 10, and 1 Pet. iii. 1, 7 see § 63. (In Rev. x. 2 *ἔχων* is subjoined independently and *ἐστὶ* can be supplied.)

In Rom. iii. 23 too, *πάντες . . . ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν* etc., the Part. cannot stand for a finite verb (even Ostermann explains it *ὑστεροῦνται καὶ δικαιοῦνται*), but the Apostle as his words show conceived the connection thus: and come short of the glory of God, in that (since) they are justified freely; the latter is proof of the former.

In 1 Cor. iii. 19 *ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν*, a quotation from the Old Test., does not form a complete sentence, but contains merely the words suited to the Apostle's purpose, cf. Heb. i. 7. What the Apostle quotes incompletely we ought not to wish to complete by annexing an *ἐστὶ*. As to 1 Pet. i. 14, see Fr. Conject. I. 41 sq.; the Part. *μὴ συσχηματιζόμενοι* may be taken as depending on *ἐλπίζατε*, or, as 331 I prefer, may be connected with *γενήθητε* vs. 15 as parallel to *κατὰ τὸν 74 ed. καλίσαντα* etc. As little reason is there in proverbs, such as 2 Pet. ii. 22 *κύνων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα* and *ὡς λουσαμένη* etc., to change the Part. into the finite verb. The words run: *a dog, that turns to his own vomit*, as if spoken *δεικτικῶς* in reference to a case under observation; just as we say in German e.g. *ein räudiges Schaf!* ('a black sheep,' Eng.) when a bad man makes himself conspicuous among the good.

In another way a Part. was taken for a finite verb, when the Part.

¹ Yet it may also be assumed that Peter wished to say: *receiving from God honor and glory — he was declared to be the beloved Son of God*, but interrupts the construction with the direct quotation of the words uttered by the voice from heaven.

seemed to express an action following that denoted by the finite verb (Bähr in Creuzer Melet. III. 50 sq.). In the N. T., however, there is no single established instance of this usage. In Luke iv. 15 ἐδίδασκεν ... 370 δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων means: *he taught being glorified of all*, — while he was glorified of all (during his teaching). Jas. ii. 9 εἰ δὲ προσωποληπτεῖτε, 316 ἁμαρτίαν ἐργάζεσθε ἐλεγχομένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου etc. is: *ye commit sin, while* 6th ed. (since) *ye are convicted*, being convicted (as προσωποληπτοῦντες); Gebser is wrong. In Heb. xi. 35 ἐτυμpanίσθησαν οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν not accepting the deliverance (offered them), προσδεξ. denotes something preceding rather than following the τυμpanίζ.; cf. Heb. ix. 12. Acts xix. 29, too, does not contain the use of the Aor. Part. in narration mentioned by Hm. Vig. 774; as ὠρμησάν τε ὁμοθυμαδὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον, συναρπάσαντες Γάϊον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον means either, *after they had seized along with themselves* (from their quarters) or, *while they seized along with them*. In Luke i. 9 ἔλαχεν τοῦ θυμῶσαι εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου, the Part. probably belongs to the Inf. (as the Vulgate takes it): entering into the temple to burn incense; Mey. is artificial. As to Rom. iii. 23, see above, p. 352. Rom. ii. 4 requires no elucidation. Likewise the peculiarity occasionally found in Greek authors, according to which the principal notion is expressed by a Part. and the secondary by a finite verb (Mtth. 1295 f.; Hm. Soph. Aj. 172; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 136), has by some been unwarrantably forced upon the N. T.; such critics having quite forgotten that the usage in question could not occur independently of any limitation involved in the nature of the ideas to be expressed. To explain 2 Cor. v. 2 στενάζομεν ... ἐπιποθοῦντες as put for ἐπιποθοῦμεν στενάζοντες is eminently infelicitous; the Part. must be regarded as subjoined to the verb, and explained as causal like στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι in vs. 4.

7. The Present Part. (with the Article) is often used substantively, and then, as a noun, excludes all indication of time. In Eph. iv. 28 ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω is not for ὁ κλέψας (as some Codd. have); but, *let the stealer* i.e. *the thief steal no more*, Heb. xi. 28. So also when it is accompanied with an Acc. of the Object, or other adjuncts; as, Gal. i. 23 ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτέ *our former persecutor*, Matt. xxvii. 40 ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν *the destroyer of the temple* (in his imagination), Rev. xv. 2 οἱ νικῶντες ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου (which Eichhorn, Einl. N. T. II. 378, mentions as singular!), xx. 10; Gal. ii. 2 (οἱ δοκοῦντες see Kypke II. 274; cf. also Pachym. 332 I. 117, 138, etc.); 1 Thess. i. 10; v. 24; 1 Pet. i. 17; Rom. v. 17; 7th ed. Jno. xii. 20 (xiii. 11); cf. Soph. Antig. 239 οὗτ' εἶδον ὅστις ἦν ὁ δρῶν, Paus. 9, 25, 5 ὅποιά ἐστιν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῇ μητρὶ τὰ δρώμενα, Diog. L. 1, 87 βραδέως ἐγχείρει τοῖς πραττομένοις (faciendis), Soph. Electr. 200 ὁ ταῦτα πράσσω, Plat. Cratyl. 416 b. ὁ τὰ ὀνόματα τιθεῖς, Demosth. Theocrin. 508 b. and frequently in the orators

ὁ τὸν νόμον τιθεῖς (legislator), ὁ γράφων τὴν μαρτυρίαν (Bremi, Demosth. p. 72) Strabo 15, 713; Arrian. Al. 5, 7, 12; Poppo, Thuc. 371 I. I. 152; Schaef. Eurip. Orest. p. 70; Demosth. V. 120, 127; poet. gnom. 228 sq., and Plutarch. V. 211 sq.; Weber, Demosth. 180; Bornem. Schol. p. 10; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 22; Maetzner ad Antiphont. p. 182. Likewise in Acts iii. 2 οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι is used substantively, *those entering*; one cannot regard it with Kühnöl 317 (Matt. p. 324), on the ground that μέλλοντας εἰσιέναι occurs in 64 vs. 3, as the Present Part. used for the Fut. The more precise expression is quite appropriate in vs. 3, as the person addressing the two apostles detained them a short time during their εἰσιέναι. (In other passages, when there is a distinct reference to past time, the Aorist Part. is used substantively; as, Jno. v. 29; Acts ix. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 12, etc., cf. ὁ ἐκείνου τεκῶν Eurip. Electr. 335, οἱ τῶν ἰόντων τεκόντες Aeschyl. Pers. 245,— Aristoph. eccl. 1126 ἡ ἐμὴ κεκτημένη, Lucian. Tim. 56.)

Such Present Participles with the Article show themselves to be complete substantives when a Genitive is joined to them, as in 1 Cor. vii. 35 πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν συμφέρον (Demosth. cor. 316 c. τὰ μικρὰ συμφέροντα τῆς πόλεως); see Lob. Soph. Aj. 238 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. p. 252.

8. In quotations from the Old Test. a Part. is occasionally connected with some person of the *same* verb (and placed before it); as, Acts vii. 34 ἰδὼν εἶδον from Exod. iii. 7 (cf. Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3), Heb. vi. 14 εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε (from Gen. xxii. 17), Matt. xiii. 14 βλέποντες βλέφετε (from Isa. vi. 9). This construction is extremely frequent in the Sept., as Judges i. 28; iv. 9; vii. 19; xi. 25; xv. 16; Gen. xxvi. 28; xxxvii. 8, 10; xliii. 6; Exod. iii. 7; 1 Sam. i. 10; iii. 21; xiv. 28; 1 Kings xi. 11; Job vi. 2; Ruth ii. 16; 1 Macc. v. 40; Judith ii. 13 (see Thiersch p. 164 sqq.), and is a Hellenizing of the Hebrew Inf. Absolute (Ewald, krit. Gr. 560 ff.), though the LXX, once accustomed to the construction, sometimes employ it even where the Hebrew contains no Inf. Absol., as in Exod. xxiii. 26. This mode of expression, however, was judiciously chosen, although in Greek prose, with the exception of that isolated ἰδὼν εἶδον in Lucian, no perfectly satisfactory parallels can be shown (Georgi, vind. p. 196 sq. has mixed together things dissimilar);¹ for in the instances

¹ Some passages have been quoted according to erroneous readings. Plat. Tim. 30c. runs thus: τίνοι τῶν ζῶντων αὐτὸν εἰς ὁμοίτητα ὁ ζυγιστὰς ζυγίστησε. Likewise Plat. Lach. 185 d. σκοπούμενοι σκοποῦμεν is questioned by recent critics, and Mül. 1301 proposes to read: σκοποῦμεν & σκοποῦμεν. Yet the singularity here consists more in the connection of the Middle and Active.

apparently corresponding the Part. carries its own idea, as in Her. 333 5, 95 *φεύγων ἐκφεύγει* fuga evadit (Diod. Sic. 17, 83), and still ⁷⁴ *ad* more in Xen. Cyr. 8, 4, 9 *ὑπακούων σχολῇ ὑπήκουσα*,¹ Lucian. 372 parasit. 43 *φεύγων ἐκείθεν . . . εἰς τ. Ταυρέου παλαιστραν κατέφυγε*, see Gataker de stylo c. 9;² Lob. paralip. p. 522. The later writers are the first to imitate this construction, as Anna Alex. 3, 80; Euseb. H. E. 6, 45. Originally this Participle implied an emphasis, though subsequently it may have become weakened. In the three ³¹⁸ passages quoted above, this emphasis is perceptible. We express ⁶⁴ *ad* it by the voice and the position of the words, or by a corresponding abverb, etc.: *well have I seen*, — *surely* (richly?) *will I bless thee*, — *with your own eyes shall ye see*, etc. Acts xiii. 45 is a construction of another sort: *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀντέλεγον τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένοις, ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ βλασφημοῦντες*, where *ἀντέλεγον* is taken up again in the Part. and strengthened by *βλασφ.*

Eph. v. 5 *τοῦτο ἵστε γινώσκοντες* probably does not come under this head, but *ἵστε* refers to what is stated in vs. 3 f., and *γινώσκ.* is construed with *ὅτι*: this, however, ye know, aware (considering) that, etc. That 1 Pet. i. 10, 12; Acts v. 4 do not come under this rule, is obvious to every one. Finally, it passes comprehension that Kühnöl should adduce Heb. x. 37 *ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἤξει* (he omits, it is true, the Article) as an instance of the above usage.

Note 1. On Participles used absolutely, see § 59. Such is also *τυχόν*, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, which is inserted in the clause as an adverb, Xen. A. 6, 1, 20; Plato, Alcib. 2, 140, etc.

Note 2. Sometimes two finite verbs are so closely connected by *καὶ*, that the first has, logically, the force of a Part., e.g. Matt. xviii. 21 *ποσάκις ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς ἐμὲ ὁ ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀφήσω αὐτόν*, i.e. *ἁμαρτήσαντι τῷ ἀδελφῷ*. This distribution of a single (logical) clause into two grammatical clauses is a peculiarity of Oriental diction, and is of frequent occurrence; see § 66, 7.

Note 3. Luke and Paul (still more, however, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews) are peculiarly fond of participial constructions. Paul accumulates Part. on Part.; cf. 1 Thess. ii. 15 f.; Tit. ii. 12, 13; 2 Cor. iv. 8–10. In narration, however, the use of Participles appears on the whole less frequent and less diversified in the N. T. than in Greek historical authors. The historical discourse of the N. T. runs on in simple

¹ It is hardly necessary to remark that the phrase *ἴδων ὁδῶν* (scio me vidisse) Athen. 6, 226; Arrian. Ind. 4, 15 does not come under this head. Cf. also *ἀκούσας ὁδῶν* Lucian. dial. mort. 28, 1.

² This author has rightly set aside the passage from Aeschyl. Prom. 447. But he found himself finally compelled to let the instance from Lucian. dial. mar. stand. Accordingly, viewed *linguistically*, it approximates the Hebrew mode of expression, a fact which Thiersch should not have questioned.

334 clauses (which are joined together especially by the oft-recurring *καί*)
 7th ed. and disdains the periodic structure in which the Greeks were so expert.
 Yet cf. Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. p. 465.

CHAPTER V.

THE PARTICLES.

§ 46. THE PARTICLES IN GENERAL.

1. Although propositions and periods can be formed by means of those inflections of the noun and verb whose syntax has been discussed in the preceding pages—(propositions, in particular, by 319 means of Cases, the use of which is so varied in Greek; periods, 6th ed. by means of Infinitives, Participles, etc.)—yet those inflections alone do not suffice for the great diversity of relations which give origin to propositions and periods. Hence language possesses besides a vast stock of so-called *particles*, by whose aid it becomes possible to construct all conceivable propositions and all their conceivable combinations. Particles are divided, as is well-known, into Prepositions, Adverbs, and Conjunctions (Rost S. 717); though respecting the boundary-lines which separate these three species from each other, grammarians have not yet been able to agree. Cf., in particular, Hm. emend. rat. p. 149 ff.

Interjections are not words, but sounds; and lie quite beyond the limits of Syntax, and indeed of Grammar.

2. Without attempting to settle the dispute among grammarians respecting the boundaries of these three classes of particles, we see at once as much as this:

1) That the classification must be made not on the basis of the words but of their signification; as it has long been acknowledged that prepositions e.g. often assume the nature of adverbs, and vice versâ (Hm. as above, p. 161),—in fact, that the prepositions are adverbs originally.

2) That all particles either serve merely to complete the structure of a simple proposition and confine their import within its 874 limits, or are designed to join one proposition to another. The latter are properly called *Conjunctions*; and if the grammarian

pays regard to the language (expressed thought) rather than to the (pure) thought, he may reckon among them the comparative particle *ὡς* (*ὡςπερ*), the particles of time (*ἐπει, ὅτε, ὁπότε*, etc.), the negative particle of design *μή* etc., so far forth as they are also connectives; so that these particles, according to their import, may be classed either as adverbs or as conjunctions. The power of adverbs and prepositions, however, is confined to the limits of a simple proposition; the structure of this they serve to complete. Prepositions denote only *relations* (of substantives); adverbs, *inherent attributes* (of terms of quality or condition, and consequently of adjectives and verbs, inasmuch as the latter are compounded of the copula and a term of quality or condition). See, especially, *Hm.*, as above, 152 ff.

We shall perhaps never succeed in effecting a thoroughly satisfactory classification of the particles, since in this matter language practically does not coincide perfectly with the philosophical method of pure theory. Much light is shed on the relation of particles to the structure of sentences by Grotefend, *Grundzüge einer neuen Satztheorie*. Hannover, 1827. 8vo.; Krüger, *Erörterung der grammat. Eintheilung und grammat. Verhältn. der Sätze*. Frft. a. M. 1826. 8vo. Cf. also Werner in the *n. Jahrb. f. Philol.* 1834. p. 85 ff.

3. The great copiousness of the Greek language in particles, as developed in the elegant literary Attic, is shared by the N. T. dic-^{tion} to but a limited extent; for not only was the (later) popular language of the Greeks in general more frugal in the use of particles, but the N. T. authors also, as they imparted a Jewish tinge to their presentations of thought, did not feel impelled to employ the niceties of Greek composition in the structure of periods. From the nature of the case, however, while they could easily dispense with the great variety of conjunctions, they could least dispense with the prepositions. In treating of particles, N. T. Grammar, if it will avoid encroaching on the department of Lexicography, should not take up the particles separately and explain in detail all their various significations, but should endeavor rather, primarily to give only a clear and discriminating delineation of the various modifications of thought which the particles are employed to designate; and then in every instance to point out *how far* these varieties of meaning have been expressed by the N. T. writers through the use of the abundant store of particles which the Greek language supplied. At the same time, however, it will take pains to exhibit in its leading traits, so far as the exist-

ing state of N. T. Lexicography and Interpretation may permit, the mutual dependence of the significations of the principal particles, and emphatically to protest against the arbitrariness of what is called *enallage particularum*.

The general subject of the Greek particles had never been in any considerable degree exhaustively treated even down to quite recent times, either as respects the facts (especially in reference to the various periods of the language) or still less as respects their philosophy. The works of 336 7th ed. Mt. Devarius (Reusmann's edition, Lips. 1793. 8vo.) and H. Hoogeveen (Amsterd. 1769. II. 4to. condensed by Schütz, Lips. 1806. 8vo.) are no longer satisfactory, especially as they entirely omit the prepositions. On the other hand, J. A. Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Partikeln der griech. Spr.* Erlang. 1832 f. II. 8vo. merits recognition. Still more helpful are the acute researches with which R. Klotz has enriched his edition of Devarius (Lips. 1835. 1842. II. 8vo.); [cf. also W. Bäumlein, *Untersuchung üb. griech. Partikeln*. Stuttg. 1861. 8vo.]. Schraut, on the other hand, *die griech. Partikeln im Zusammenhange mit den ältesten Stämmen der Sprache* (Neuss, 1848), is too fanciful. A comparative treatment is given by E. A. Fritsch, *vergleich. Bearbeit. d. griech. u. lat. Partikeln*. Giessen, 1856. 8vo. For the biblical particles a *Lexicon Particularum* to the Sept. and the Apocrypha is a desideratum, as the concordances and Schleusner also in his *Thesaur. Philol.* have entirely omitted these words. (Bruder, as is well known, has carefully inserted the particles in his N. T. Concordance.) Tittmann's treatise on N. T. Particles (*de usu particular. N. T. Cap. 1, 2*, Lips. 1831. II. 4to., also in his *Synonym. N. T. II. 42 sqq.*) is not thoroughly to be commended; moreover it was interrupted by the death of the acute and learned author, who however did not pay due attention to the actual usage of the language.

321 6th ed. § 47. THE PREPOSITIONS IN GENERAL,¹ AND SUCH AS GOVERN THE GENITIVE IN PARTICULAR.

1. The prepositions correspond to the cases; hence each according to its signification is connected with a particular case, viz. with that case whose primary meaning accords with the primary meaning of the preposition. Prepositions are employed where the cases are insufficient to indicate a relation (for these relations are extremely diversified), and sometimes also where a case would 376 have sufficed indeed, but on account of the variety of its uses did

¹ Cf. *Hm.* de emend. rat. p. 161 sqq; *B. G. Weiske*, de praeposition. gr. comment. Gorlic. 1809 f.; *K. G. Schmidt*, quaestion. grammat. de praeposition. gr. Berol. 1829. 8vo.; *Döderlein*, *Reden u. Aufs.* II. nr. 3; *Bhdg.* S. 195 ff.; *Schneider*, *Vorles.* S. 181 ff.

not appear to the speaker to be definite enough for his purpose. They are relatively more numerous in the N. T. than in Greek prose, because the apostles had not such an inherent sense as cultivated native Greeks of the extended application of the cases; besides, the Oriental prefers the more vivid expression; and moreover, the Hebrew-Aramaic language indicates by means of prepositions nearly all those relations which are designated in Greek by cases alone.

2. In treating of prepositions it is necessary, in the first place, 337 to seize with clearness and precision the true primary meaning of ^{7th ed.} each from which all its applications emanate as from a common centre, and to trace back to this all the various shades of meaning the preposition may have assumed, — i.e. to show how the transition to every such application was effected in the mind of the speaker or writer; and secondly, to take cognizance of the case, and the necessity for it, which is joined to a given preposition, either in general or in a particular range of significations (Bernhardi, allg. Sprachl. I. 164 f.), and in turn to make use of this knowledge in fixing the limits of the signification of the prepositions themselves. The former, viz. the determination of the primary meaning of the prepositions as exhibited now in their construction with the Gen. now with the Dat. etc., will set in its true light the mutual interchange of prepositions, which in the N. T. has been thought to be wholly unlimited. The latter must be performed without a passion for over-strained refinements, and with a recognition at the outset of the fact that, according to the special, and according to the more or less precise, perception of a relation to be expressed (particularly if mental), one and the same preposition may be construed with several different cases (cf. Hm. emend. rat. 163).

In treating of prepositions in the N. T., it is only necessary to add first, a notice of how far later Greek, and in particular the popular language, extended the use and import of prepositions, obliterated their nicer distinctions, and was led probably even into 322 improprieties in employing them; further, to pay constant regard ^{6th ed.} to the Hebrew-Aramaic, which delights in the use of prepositions and presents numerous relations under aspects different from the Greek (cf. e.g. *ὁμῶσαι ἐν τινι*, *ἀποκτείνειν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ*); and finally, not to leave out of sight the distinctively Christian view ³⁷⁷ which underlies the use of many prepositions (e.g. *ἐν Χριστῷ* or *κυρίῳ*).

The maltreatment of the prepositions until a few decades ago on the

part of N. T. philologists in Lexicons and Commentaries (e.g. Koppe's N. T.) was really horrible;¹ but it found precedent and support in the purely empirical treatment of the Hebrew prepositions current until Ewald's time, see my exeget. Stud. I. 27 ff. Wahl was the first to pursue a better course; and almost everybody now has begun to be ashamed of the license just described.

As respects in particular the comparative predominance of the Greek element and of the Hebrew-Aramaic in the use of the prepositions, it must not be overlooked, 1) that many constructions which the N. T. writers adopted through the influence of their mother tongue, occur also in Greek poets and later prose writers, so diversified is the use of the Greek prepositions; 2) that though in the more Hebraistic portions of the N. T. (particularly in the Revelation) the exposition from the Hebrew suggests itself, yet we must not on that account explain the Greek prepositions in all the books indiscriminately by a reference to the Hebrew; for simultaneously with the Greek prepositions a multitude of special linguistic relations had been communicated to the Apostles, and close observation shows that as respects the relations expressed by prepositions the Apostles had already become accustomed to think in Greek; 3) that, especially in Paul (and John), the un-Hellenic application of several prepositions (e.g. ἐν) is closely connected with doctrinal phraseology, and belongs to the Apostolic (Christian) element in N. T. diction.

3. The *proper* and the *metaphorical* significations of each preposition must be accurately distinguished. The former always refer primarily to *local* relations (Bernhardi I. 290); and if these are conceived in great multiplicity by a nation, a corresponding multiplicity of prepositions is the result. The simple relations of place are but two, — that of rest and that of motion (or even merely of direction, which is viewed as more or less a motion). The latter, however, comprises motion *towards* and motion *from*. The notion of rest is denoted by the Dative; that of motion *towards*, by the Accusative; that of motion *from*, by the Genitive.

323 *Local* designations to which single prepositions correspond are,
6th ed. a) of rest: *in* ἐν, *by the side of* παρὰ, *upon* ἐπὶ, *over* ὑπέρ, *under*
378 (ὑπό), *amid (with)* μετά, *before* πρό, *behind* ὑπό, *on (up on)* ἀνά,
about ἀμφί, *around* περί, *over against* ἀντί; b) of (direction) motion *towards* a point: *into* εἰς, *towards* κατά, *to* πρὸς, *upon* ἐπὶ, *to beside* παρὰ, *under* ὑπό; c) of (direction) motion *from*: *out of* ἐκ, *from* ἀπό, *from under* ὑπό, *down from* κατά, *from beside* παρὰ. To the last division may be referred *through* relating to space (διά)

¹ Tittmann, de scriptor. N. T. diligentia gramm. p. 12 (Synon. I. 207): nulla est, ne repugnans quidem significatio, quin quaecunque praepositio eam in N. T. habere dicatur.

(cf. Progr. de verbor. cum praeposs. compositor. in N. T. usu V. p. 3), for which the Hebrew uses מִן , and the German sometimes *aus* (e.g. *aus dem Thore gehen*).

4. Language deals at first with the ideas of *time* by taking local relations as the pattern; hence temporal senses also are put upon most of the prepositions. Not till later does the transition ensue to immaterial, purely ideal relations, which every nation conceives under forms more or less material. This produces a corresponding diversity in national modes of expression. A Greek, for instance, says, λέγειν περί τινος; a Roman, dicere de aliqua re; a Hebrew, מִן דבר; a German, über etwas sprechen. The first views the object as a central point which the speaker as it were *encom- 339 passes* (to speak *about* a thing); the Roman, as a whole of which the speaker imparts something to the hearer (*de* as it were to speak off something from the object);¹ the Hebrew, as the ground on which the speaker stands (to speak *on* something); the German, as something lying before the speaker *over* which his discourse extends (for über governs in this connection the Accusative).

The notion of *origin*, and consequently of *cause*, is most naturally implied in the prepositions from, out of (ἀπό, ὑπό, παρά, ἐκ); that of *occasion*, and consequently also of *motive*, in πρὸς, εἰς (e.g. *on* the report), ἐπί with the Dat. and διὰ with the Acc. (on account of). Here ἐπί refers to the basis on which something rests; hence we also use the word *ground* for *reason*. *Design* and *aim* expressed by *to* are denoted by ἐπί with the Dat., or by εἰς or πρὸς with the Acc. *Condition* is expressed by ἐπί with the Dat., just as we say by a 379 similar metaphor: auf Lohn Recht sprechen. The *object* which underlies an emotion is indicated by ἐπί with the Gen., as in German sich freuen über (rejoice *over*), stolz sein auf (pride one's self *on*). To speak in reference to an object is λέγειν περί τινος (see above). The *rule*, or standard, is expressed either by *after* (πρὸς, κατὰ) or by *from* (ἐκ); in the former construction, the rule is conceived as something *after*, *according to*, which a thing is to shape itself; in the latter, as that *from* which the thing regulated is derived. Lastly, the *means* finds natural expression in διὰ with the Gen., 324 sometimes in ἐν. 6th ed.

5. One preposition may sometimes, no doubt, be employed for another; but we must deduct from instances of this class all those in which an immaterial relation may be expressed with equal pro-

¹ As to the primary import of the Latin *de*, see Heidtmann in the Zeitschr. f. Alterth. Wiss. 1846. no. 109 f.

priety by several different prepositions,¹ (loqui *de re* and *super re*, ζῆν *ἐκ* and *ἀπό* τινος, ὠφελεῖσθαι *ἀπό* and *ἐκ* τ. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 34; Mem. 2, 4, 1, also *ἐπὶ* τινι, ἀποκτείνεσθαι *ἀπό* and *ἐκ* τινος Rev. ix. 18, ἀποθνήσκειν *ἐκ* τινος Rev. viii. 11 and *ὑπὸ* τ., ἀποθνήσκειν *ὑπέρ* and *περὶ* τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἀγωνίζεσθαι *περὶ* and *ὑπέρ* τινος, ἐκλέγεσθαι *ἀπὸ* and *ἐκ* τῶν μαθητῶν).² This cannot be called *enallage* of prepositions. On the other hand, particularly in expressing *local* relations, the more comprehensive preposition may be used for the more restricted, (as Luke xxiv. 2 ἀποκυλίζειν τὸν λίθον *ἀπὸ* τοῦ μνημείου, but Mark xvi. 3 *ἐκ* τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; the latter agrees better with the precise facts of the case: *out of* the door — cut into the rock). This is sometimes attributable to the fact that it does not seem to be everywhere necessary to speak with entire precision, sometimes the author may through negligence have used the more indefinite term for the more definite. The interchange of prepositions is only apparent when any of them is employed *prægnanter*, i.e. when it includes also a second relation, the antecedent or consequent of that which it strictly expresses, as κατοικεῖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, εἶναι ὑπὸ νόμον; or in case of an attraction, as αἶρειν τὰ *ἐκ* τῆς οἰκίας Matt. xxiv. 17, ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον Luke ix. 61.

An arbitrary interchange of prepositions — (of which the earlier N. T. commentaries are full, and which was upheld in part by an abuse of parallel passages, especially in the gospels) — would never have entered the imagination of critics, had they been accustomed to consider language as a *living* instrument of social intercourse. It is really preposterous to suppose that any one could have said, ‘he is travelling *to* Egypt’ for ‘he is travelling *in* Egypt’ (εἰς for ἐν); or, ‘all is *for* him’ instead of ‘all is *from* him.’ In expressing *by*, for instance, διὰ and ἐν are not thoroughly equivalent to each other, particularly διὰ Ἰ. Χριστοῦ and ἐν Ἰ. Χριστῷ. In Latin, also, *per* (before names of persons) and the Ablative (of things) are usually distinguished. Close observation shows in general how correctly the N. T. writers discriminate between those prepositions even which

¹ Thus Paul sometimes employs different prepositions in parallel clauses, to give variety to his discourse; as, Rom. iii. 30 *ὅς* δικαιώσει περιτομὴν *ἐκ* πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν *διὰ* τῆς πίστεως, Eph. iii. 8 f.

² Sometimes in different languages the same relation, because viewed under different aspects, is expressed by prepositions of exactly opposite significations. Thus Germans say, *zur* Rechten; the Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews, *a dextra* etc. Even one and the same language may express a relation, especially if ideal, by opposite prepositions. We say *on* the condition and *under* the condition. In South Germany they say, relation or friend *to* (zu) one; in Saxony, relation or friend *of* (von) one. How ridiculous it would be to infer from such instances, that *of* (von) is sometimes equivalent to *to* (zu), and *on* to *under*!

are closely allied (e.g. Rom. xiii. 1 οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὔσαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν).¹ And we ought to honor them and ourselves by recognizing everywhere their scrupulous care. 325
6th ed.

Where either of two prepositions might be employed with equal propriety, a preference for *one* in the N. T. is perhaps to be attributed to the Hellenistic tinge of its diction; this, at least, the critic must take into consideration as a possibility. Planck, however (articuli nonnulli Lex. nov. in N. T. Goett. 1824. 4to. p. 14), is mistaken in supposing that ἀγαθὸς πρὸς τι (Eph. iv. 29) is less correct Greek than εἰς τι. The former construction is of frequent occurrence, e.g. Theophr. hist. plant. 4, 3, 1 and 7; 9, 13, 3; Xen. Mem. 4, 6, 10, etc.; see Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 278.

With such prepositions as in different significations govern different cases, it is sometimes possible, when *immaterial* relations are to be expressed, to use either of two cases with equal correctness (as ἐπὶ with Gen. or Acc.). Sometimes the Codd. vary between the two; see Rom. viii. 11. In the N. T. this has been erroneously said to hold frequently in reference to διά; see below, § 47, i, d. p. 381, cf. § 49 c. Purely external relations, on the contrary, sustain no such interchange in careful writers; only very late, especially the Byzantine, authors indulge in it, and confound e.g. μερά with the Gen. and with the Acc.; see the word in the Index to Malalas in the Bonn ed., cf. Schaeff. Ind. ad Aesop. p. 136; Boisson. Anecd. IV. 487; V. 84.² Indeed the later writers have already become so devoid of an appreciation of the cases as to begin to connect prepositions even with cases altogether foreign to them, — ἀπό, for instance, with Acc. and Dat., καρά with Dat., σύν with Gen.; see Index to Leo Gramm. and Theophan.³ 341
7th ed.

The attempt, recently revived, to explain this alleged interchange of cases in the N. T. by the circumstance that Hebrew has no cases, is to be rejected, if for no other reason, because apart from a very small number of doubtful exceptions the N. T. writers exhibit a correct perception of the differences between the cases.

The position of prepositions is more simple in the N. T. than in the classics, Mth. II. 1399 f. They are uniformly placed immediately before the noun, and only those conjunctions which never stand at the beginning of a clause intervene between preposition and substantive; as, δέ Matt. xi. 12; xxii. 31; xxiv. 22, 36; Acts v. 12, γάρ Jno. iv. 37; v. 46; Acts viii. 23; Rom. iii. 20, τε Acts x. 39; xxv. 24, γε Luke xi. 8; xviii. 5, μὲν and μὲν γάρ Rom. xi. 22; Acts xxviii. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 4.

¹ Hence I cannot admit what Lücke, Apokal. II. 458, says about an irregular and inconsistent use of prepositions in the N. T.

² In close succession μερά signifying *with* takes the Acc. and then the Gen. in Acta apocryph. p. 257.

³ The case is different with ἐν followed by the Acc.; see Schaeff. Dion. comp. p. 305; Ross, inscriptt. gr. I. 37.

326

PREPOSITIONS WITH THE GENITIVE.

6th ed.

a. Ἀντί (Lat. *ante*), of which the local meaning is (directly) *before, in front of, over-against*, denotes figuratively barter, exchange (Plato, conv. 218 e.), in which one thing is given *for, instead of*, another (tooth *for* tooth, Matt. v. 38), and in consequence assumes its place. It governs the Genitive, that being the case of (issuing from and) exchange (see above, p. 206), e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 15 ἡ κόμη ἀντὶ περιβολαίου δέδοται (τῇ γυναικί) her hair *for*, instead of, a covering (to serve her as a covering, cf. Lucian. philops. 22; Liban. ep. 350), Heb. xii. 16 ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μᾶς ἀπέδοτο τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ, vs. 2 ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς ὑπέμεινε σταυρόν (*for* the joy that was set before him, *against* this setting death on the cross), Matt. xx. 28 δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, xvii. 27 ἐκείνον (στατήρα) λαβὼν δὸς αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ, ii. 22 Ἀρχέλαος βασιλεύει ἀντὶ Ἡρώδου *in place of* Herod, cf. 342 Her. 1, 108; Xen. A. 1, 1, 4; 1 Kings xi. 44. Hence ἀντί is the 7th ed. preposition chiefly used to denote *the price for, in exchange for*, which one gives or receives an article of merchandise (Heb. 382 xii. 16); then, to denote requital (Lev. xxiv. 20) and *reward* (bordering on the causal sense, like the Germ. ob) e.g. ἀνθ' ὧν (as a recompense) *for this (that)*, i.e. *because*, Luke i. 20; xix. 44; Plat. Menex. 244; Xen. A. 5, 5, 14; 1 Kings xi. 11; Joel iii. 5; or *on which account* (wherefore) Luke xii. 3; ἀντὶ τούτου Eph. v. 31 (Sept.) *therefore, for this*, cf. Pausan. 10, 38, 5. Ἀντί is used in Jno. i. 16 ἐλάβομεν . . . χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος in a peculiar application, referable, however, to its primary import: grace *over*, upon, grace (Theogn. sent. 344 ἀντ' ἀνιῶν ἀνίας), strictly grace *against, for*, grace, grace *in the place of* that which preceded, therefore grace uninterrupted, unceasingly renewed.

b. Ἀπό, ἐκ, παρά, and ὑπό, all denote *issuing, proceeding from* — the generic import of the Genitive — but with some diversity as respects the previous mutual relation of the objects in question. Beyond doubt ἐκ indicates the closest connection; ὑπό, one less close; παρά (de chez moi, عندي), and especially ἀπό,¹ one still more distant. Accordingly, these prepositions may be ranged in

¹ The distinction between ἀπό and ἐκ is perceptible in Luke ii. 4 (cf. also Acts xxiii. 34); but in Jno. xi. 1 (see Lücke in loc.) and Rev. ix. 18 ἀπό and ἐκ are employed as synonymous. Cf. also Luke xxi. 18 with Acts xxvii. 34. On the other hand, in the parallel passages Mark xvi. 3 and Luke xxiv. 2 ἀπό and ἐκ are respectively used, — *out of* the door, the more precise (and suitable) expression, and (away) *from* the sepulchre, the more loose; see p. 362.

the following order, proceeding from the most intimate connection to the more remote: *ἐκ*, *ὑπό*, *παρά*, *ἀπό*. Further, if merely the idea of *proceeding from* is to be expressed, *ἀπό* is used. If the proceeding is definitely thought of as from *a person*, *παρά* or *ὑπό* is required. If the person is to be indicated only in a general way as the point of departure, *παρά* is used; if represented strictly as the efficient, producing cause, *ὑπό* is selected, and hence is the 327 regular preposition after passives. Finally, the idea of *distance* ^{6th ed.} and *separation* attaches itself to *ἀπό*; so that both *ἀπό* and *ἐκ* express *disjoining* and *removal*, while these notions are not directly implied by *παρά* and *ὑπό*.

Παρά is used properly in reference to objects proceeding from one's *vicinity* or *sphere of power* (*παρά* with Gen. used antithetically to *πρός* with Acc. in Lucian. Tim. 53), e.g. Mark xiv. 43 *παραγίνεται ὄχλος πολλὸς . . . παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων* from the chief priests (near whom, about whom, they served; cf. Lucian. philops. 5; Demosth. Polycl. 710 b.), xii. 2 *ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ* part of the produce which was in the hands of the husbandmen; Jno. xvi. 27 *ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον* (cf. i. 1 *ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*), v. 41 (Plat. rep. 10, 612 d.); xv. 26; 343 Eph. vi. 8; Luke ii. 1; 2 Pet. i. 17. Accordingly, it is joined to ^{7th ed.} verbs of *inquiring* and *asking* Matt. ii. 4, 16; Mark viii. 11; Jno. 383 iv. 9, of *learning* 2 Tim. iii. 14; Acts xxiv. 8 (Xen. C. 2, 2, 6; Plat. Euth. 12 e.), the matter to be learned etc. being viewed as in some one's (mental) possession (*ἀπό* Mark xv. 45; Gal. iii. 2 expressing this more indefinitely; *ἐκ τινος* Xen. Oec. 13, 6 with greater precision). It is only in later writers that *παρά* is used after Passive verbs as exactly equivalent to *ὑπό* (Bast, ep. crit. p. 156, 235; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. II. 172). In Acts xxii. 30 *τι κατηγορεῖται παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, Luke could hardly have said *ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* (they had as yet laid no formal charge, had not yet taken measures for a regular prosecution), the meaning is: of what he is accused *on the part of* the Jews. Matt. xxi. 42 *παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη* (Sept.) means: this is from the Lord (*divinitus*, through means under God's control); and Jno. i. 6 *ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ*: he made his appearance, sent from God, cf. vs. 1 *ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*.

In no passage of the N. T. do we find *παρά* with Gen. used for *παρὰ* with Dat., as is sometimes assumed in Greek authors (Schæf. Dion. comp. p. 118 sq.; Held, Plut. Tim. p. 427). In 2 Tim. i. 18 *εὕρισκεν* implies the notion of *procuring*; (otherwise in Luke i. 30 *ἔσπες χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*

with God.) Mark v. 26 is to be explained by attraction; probably, however, in iii. 21 οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ are *his kindred* (those descended *from him*, those belonging to him), see Fr. in loc. cf. Susann. 33. As to παρά in a circumlocution for the Gen. see § 30, 3, note 5. That τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν Phil. iv. 18, and τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν Luke x. 7, are not strictly equivalent to τὰ ὑμῶν (ὑμέτερα), αὐτῶν, is obvious; in both passages the phrase is accompanied by a verb of receiving (having received the things sent from you i.e. your presents; eating what is set before you from (by) them).

Ἐκ originally denotes issuing *from within* (the compass, sphere, of) something (antithetic to εἰς Luke x. 7; xvii. 24; Herod. 4, 15, 10; Aesch. dial. 3, 11), e.g. Luke vi. 42 ἐκβαλε τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ (it was ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ), Matt. viii. 28 ἐκ τῶν μνημείων
 328 ἐξερχόμενοι, Acts ix. 3 περιήστραψεν αὐτὸν φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,
 328 Matt. i. 16 ἐξ ἧς (Μαρίας) ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς, vs. 3; 1 Pet. i. 23. Concisely in Luke v. 3 ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου *out of the ship* (speaking from on board) cf. ii. 35. Allied to this is the use of ἐκ to denote the *material out of which* a thing is made, Matt. xxvii. 29; Rom. ix. 21; cf. Herod. 8, 4, 27; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 150; then, the *mass or store out of which* a thing is taken, Jno.
 384 vi. 50 φαγεῖν ἐξ ἄρτου, Luke viii. 3; 1 Jno. iv. 13 ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν *he hath given us of his Spirit*; further, the *class* to which one belongs, (*out*) of which one is, Jno. vii. 48 μή τις ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐπίστευσεν; iii. 1 ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, xvi. 17 εἰπον ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν (τινες), 2 Tim. iii. 6; 2 Jno. 4; Rev. ii. 10,
 344 or the *country from which* one derived his origin, Acts xxiii. 34,
 344 the *progenitor from whom* one is descended, Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων (Plato, Phaedr. 246 a., cf. δουλέκδουλος D.S. exc. Vat. p. 31), cf. Heb. ii. 11; lastly, the *situation, state out of which* one comes, Rev. ix. 20, or (by brachylogy) *out of which* he undertakes something, 2 Cor. ii. 4 ἐκ πολλῆς θλίψεως ... ἔγραψα ὑμῖν. Sometimes ἐκ is used in a local sense, like the Latin *ex* for *de* (*down from*), Acts xxviii. 4 κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρός (Judith viii. 24; xiv. 11; Odyss. 8, 67; Her. 4, 10; Xen. M. 3, 10, 13), Acts xxvii. 29, or, with less precision,¹ Heb. xiii. 10 φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου *from the altar* (what was laid as an offering *upon* the altar);²

¹ Mark xvi. 3 does not come under this head: see above, no. 5, p. 362. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the same relation may be conceived somewhat differently in different languages, and yet with equal propriety: e.g. Rom. xiii. 11 ἐγερθῆναι ἐκ ὕπνου, (aufstehen vom Schläfe) arise *out of, from*, sleep. In Rev. vi. 14 ἐκ is probably used designedly, as the mountains are rooted in the earth. It is certainly so used in Jno. xx. 1.

² In the N. T. καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου is unique, Matt. xvii. 9 (Exod. xix. 14;

sometimes it denotes mere direction, *from*, Matt. xx. 21 *ἵνα καθίσωσιν ... εἰς ἐκ δεξιῶν* etc., Heb. i. 13 (Bleek in loc.), where the Germ. says *on (to) the right*, zur Rechten, the Lat. a dextra, the Hebr. *יָמָן*. In making such specifications it is a matter of indifference whether the mind proceeds from the object to be located (towards itself), or from itself towards the object. The former conception the Greeks have adopted (*ἐκ δεξιῶν*), the latter, the Germans; cf. Goeller, Thuc. 8, 33. For analogous expressions see Thuc. 1. 64; 3, 51, and Her. 3, 101 *οἰκέουσι πρὸς νότου ἀνέμου*. When used of *time*, *ἐκ* denotes the point of departure of a temporal series *since* which something continues to exist, Acts xxiv. 10 *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ὄντα σε κριτήν* etc. Jno. vi. 66; ix. 1; Acts ix. 33; Gal. i. 15, *ἐξ ἰκανοῦ* Luke xxiii. 8 (like *ἐκ πολλοῦ*).¹ Here the Greek says *out of*, viewing the time specified, not as we do as a point *from* 385 which something is reckoned, but by a more vivid conception as an 329 expanse *out of* which something extends (as *ἐξ ἡμέρας, ἐξ ἔτους* etc.).^{6th ed.}

Figuratively, this preposition denotes every *source* and *cause out of* which something issues (hence *ἐκ* and *διὰ* are related, Franke, Dem. p. 8; Held, Plut. Tim. 331, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 332), and is applied either to things or persons, Acts xix. 25; Rom. x. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 2; iii. 5. Under this head the following applications of *ἐκ* deserve attention: Rev. viii. 11 *ἀποθήσκειν ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων* (ix. 18; Dio C. p. 239, 27, cf. Iliad. 18, 107), Rev. xv. 2 *νικᾶν ἐκ τινος* (victoriam ferre *ex* aliq. Liv. 8, 8 extr.), 1 Cor. ix. 14 345 *ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν* (Luke xii. 15 cf. with *ἀπό* Aristot. pol. 3, 3,² 1st ed. *ex* ripto vivere Ovid. Met. 1, 144), Luke xvi. 9 *ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας*, Rom. i. 4 *ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν* (source *out of* which convincing evidence flows, cf. Jas. ii. 18). Its use in reference to persons³ is especially fre-

xxxii. 1), for which in other passages we find *καταβ. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους*, Matt. viii. 1; Mark ix. 9; Luke ix. 37.

¹ The N. T. passages formerly adduced to show that *ἐκ* means *statim post* do not establish the assertion. Luke xi. 6 signifies come in *from a journey*; xii. 36 return *from the wedding*; Jno. iv. 6 fatigued *from (by) the journey*; 2 Cor. iv. 6 *out of* darkness, Night etc. In many of these passages to render *ἐκ immediately after* would be altogether unsuitable; in others it would obtrude a specification of time where the writer thought primarily only of the condition *from, out of* which, etc. Least of all can *ἐκ* be translated *immediately after* in Heb. xi. 35.

² Ζῆν *ἐκ τοῦ δικαίου* Demosth. Eubul. 540 b., which Wahl quotes in his Clavis, does not come under this head.

³ This use is very extended, particularly in Herodot., see Schweighauser. Lex. Herod. p. 192. Further, cf. e.g. Diog. L. 1, 64; Philostr. Soph. 2, 12 etc. and Sturz, Lexic. Xen. II. 88.

quent and diversified ; compare besides, Jno. iii. 25 ἐγένετο ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου (Plato, Theaet. 171 a.), Matt. i. 18 ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, Jno. vii. 22 οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐστὶν (ἡ περιτομή), Rom. xiii. 3 ἔξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς (ἐξουσίας), Jno. x. 32 πολλὰ καλὰ ἔργα ἔδειξα ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, vi. 65 (Her. 8, 114), xviii. 3 ; 1 Cor. vii. 7 ; 2 Cor. ii. 2 ; Rom. v. 16 (Fr. inaccurately translates it by *per*) ; most of all in reference to sovereigns, rulers, magistrates, Xen. An. 1, 1, 6 ; Cyr. 8, 6, 9 ; Her. 1, 69. 121 ; 2, 151 ; Polyb. 15, 4, 7. Ἐκ is specially employed to express the *mental state*, the *disposition out of* which something springs, 1 Tim. i. 5 (Rom. vi. 17), Mark xii. 30 ; Phil. i. 16 ; 1 Thess. ii. 3 (Plato, Phil. 22 b. ; Xen. An. 7, 7, 43 ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς φίλος ἦν, Arrian. Ep. 3, 22, 18 ; Aristoph. nub. 86) ; then *the occasion*, Rev. xvi. 21 ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸν θεὸν ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς (but not, as Meyer thinks [yet no longer, 4th ed.], in 1 Cor. x. 17) and *the ground* (ratio), Rev. viii. 13 — for each is the source of its consequence (Lucian. asin. 46 ; Demosth. Con. 727 b.) ; ¹ *the basis* 386 *of a judgment* (from which a judgment is deduced), Matt. xii. (33) 37 see Kypke in loc., Rev. xx. 12 ; Xen. C. 2, 2, 21 and 3, 6 ; Aesop. 93, 4 (by a different metaphor we say judge *according to*, *on*, cf. ἐν 1 Jno. iii. 19 ; v. 2), and consequently the *standard*, 2 Cor. viii. 11. Ἐκ, moreover, sometimes denotes the *price* of a thing, Matt. xxvii. 7 ἠγόρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν (ἀργυρίων) ἀγρόν (Palaeph. 46, 3), inasmuch as the property is viewed as accruing to us *out of* the money (given for it), cf. Matt. xx. 2 (where the expression is abbreviated). As to ἐξ ἔργων εἶναι and similar phrases in Gal. iii. 10 ; Rom. iii. 26 ; iv. 14, 16 ; Phil. i. 17 ; Tit. i. 10, see my Comment. on the first passage. In general, the phrase εἶναι ἐκ 330 *τινος* partakes of all the diversified significations of the preposition, 6th ed. cf. e.g. 1 Cor. xii. 15 ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ χεῖρ, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ; by an opposite conception we say belong *to* the body.

That ἐκ never stands for ἐν (as has been assumed even in Greek authors 346 occasionally, see Poppo, Thuc. 2, 7 ; 8, 62) is beyond question. As to 7th ed. the attraction in Matt. xxiv. 17 αἶψα τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας see § 66, cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 493.

ὑπό signifies *from under*, *out from under* (ὑποῦ) e.g. Hesiod. theog. 669 Ζεὺς . . . ὑπὸ χθονὸς ἦκε etc. Plato, Phaedr. 230 b.

¹ Other passages adduced (e.g. by Bretschn.) to prove that ἐκ means *on account of*, are to be excluded. Rom. v. 16 is easily referrible to the idea of source. Acts xxviii. 3 may be rendered, gliding forth *out of* the heat ; recent editors, however, read ἀπὸ.

It commonly accompanies Passive verbs¹—in order to designate the subject *from* whom the action proceeds, who had the power, therefore, to do or to omit it,—and Neuter verbs also which can be used as Passives; as, 1 Cor. x. 9 ὑπὸ τῶν ὀφείων ἀπώλοντο, Matt. xvii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 24; cf. Demosth. Olynth. 3, p. 10 c.; Lucian. Peregr. 19; Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 45; An. 7, 2, 22; Lysias in Theomnest. 4; Pausan. 9, 7, 2; Plat. apol. 17 a. and conv. 222 e.; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 28; Polyæn. 5, 2, 15, and Porson, Eur. Med. p. 97; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 880. In these instances the forces which have produced death, destruction, etc., are regarded as *efficient causes*, killing, destroying, etc.; if, on the contrary, ἀπό had been used (cf. παθεῖν ἀπό Matt. xvi. 21), they would have been 387 designated merely as that from which a result ensued (*occasional causes*). In the former case, the Active construction, *the serpents destroyed*, etc. might have been directly substituted; in the latter, it would be inaccurate. Cf. the difference between βλάπτεισθαι ἀπό τινος and ὑπό τινος in Xen. C. 1, 3, 30; Aeschin. dial. 2, 11. See, in general, Engelhardt, Plat. Apol. p. 174 sq.; Lehmann, Lucian. VIII. 450; II. 23; Schulz vom Abendm. S. 218. Further, ὑπό is applied not merely to persons or animate beings, but also to inanimate agencies, 1 Cor. vi. 12; Col. ii. 18; Jas. i. 14, etc.

The meaning of 2 Pet. i. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιάδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης is simply: *when such a voice was borne to him by the exalted Majesty*. All other expositions are arbitrary.

Ἀπό means, locally, *from* in the widest sense—whether what has come *from* anything, may have been previously *on*, *with*, *at*, or *beside* (even *in*) the object in question,—principally, therefore, 331 the opposite of ἐπὶ with the Acc. Diog. L. 1, 24; as, Luke xxiv. 2 εὗρον τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, Matt. xiv. 29 καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου coming down *from* the ship (he was *on* the ship), iii. 16 ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος up *from* the water (not *out of* the water), xv. 27 τῶν ψυχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης (they were *on* the table), Acts xxv. 1 ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπὸ 347 7th ed.

¹ 2 Pet. ii. 7 ὁπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἀνατροφῆς ἐρρύσατο would be an instance of the transition if the words were taken as they stand (*out of* the power of the conduct of the lawless, *under* the influence of which Lot had been left) cf. Iliad. 9, 248 ἐρύεσθαι ὑπὸ Τρώων ὀρυμαγδοῦ, 23, 86. See, in general, *Hm.* Eurip. Hec. p. 11. But the usual mode of connecting ὑπὸ τῆς with καταπονούμενον is to be preferred. Moreover, in Luke viii. 14 also, ὑπό after a Passive is to be recognized (Active Matt. xiii. 22 and Mark iv. 19), where Bornemann has proposed another, but not a satisfactory (construction and) exposition, in which, however, *Mey.* concurs.

Καίσαρας from (not out of) Caesarea. In its developed application (whether in the realm of matter or of mind) *ἀπό* specially indicates,

a) *Separating, letting go, desisting*, Matt. vii. 23 *ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ*, Luke xxiv. 31 *ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν*, Heb. iv. 4 *κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων*, Rev. xviii. 14 (cf. also *ἀποκρύπτειν*, *παρακαλύπτειν ἀπό* Matt. xi. 25; Luke ix. 45, and the pregnant phrases in Col. ii. 20; Rom. ix. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 2; Acts viii. 22; 2 Cor. xi. 3 and the like), and consequently, *remoteness*, Jno. xxi. 8 (Rev. xii. 14; cf. Xen. An. 3, 3, 9; Soph. Oed. Col. 900). Far more frequently,

b) *Proceeding from*, in any respect, — especially temporal origin and commencement *from . . . forward, since* Matt. ix. 22; xxv. 84; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Acts iii. 24, or the *commencement of a series* Matt. ii. 16; Luke xxiv. 27; Jude 14 (*ἀπὸ . . . ἕως* Matt. i. 17; xi. 12; Acts viii. 10, *ἀπὸ . . . εἰς* 2 Cor. iii. 18); hence the *source, material, or mass*, from which anything comes, Matt. iii. 4 (Lucian. 888 dial. deor. 7, 4; Her. 7, 65), Acts ii. 17 (Sept.) *ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου*, Luke vi. 13; xv. 16; Jno. xxi. 10; Matt. vii. 16. Further, *ἀπό* expresses *derivation* under manifold aspects Jude 23, *descent* (from a people or country), hence *place of abode, sect* Matt. xxi. 11; xxvii. 57; Jno. xi. 1; xii. 21; Acts ii. 5; xv. 5; Heb. vii. 13 (Polyb. 5, 70, 8; Plut. Brut. c. 2; Her. 8, 114); especially does it indicate, concretely, the *personal* point of departure of an efficiency (viewed merely as such, — not as a conscious and self-moved power, to denote which *παρά* is used with Neuter verbs Schulz, Abdm. S. 215 ff.,¹ and *ὑπό*² with Passives, in the N. T. as

¹ After verbs of receiving, borrowing, etc. *ἀπό* merely designates simply and in general the whence: Matt. xvii. 25 *ἀπὸ τίνων λαμβάνουσι τέλη*; it is *kings* who are the *λαμβάνοντες*; *παρά* would have indicated the immediate source, and would have been employed in this passage had the *tax-gatherers* been the *λαμβάνοντες*. In the expression *λαμβάνειν παρὰ τινος*, the *τις* is always viewed as active (as giving or tendering); in *λαμβάνειν ἀπὸ τινος*, merely as the proprietor. In 3 Jno. 7 the apostle would have used *παρὰ* and not *ἀπὸ* (*τῶν ἐθνῶν*) if the meaning had been that the Gentiles had actually *tendered* a gratuity. In Col. iii. 24 *ἀπὸ κυρίου ἀπολήψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν* the reward is indicated as *proceeding from* the Lord; *παρὰ κυρ.*, which Paul might have employed here, would have denoted the Lord's *direct communicating* of the reward. On the other hand, Christ says in Jno. x. 18 with precision, *ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς*. Paul likewise, in 1 Cor. xi. 23, writes *παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* I received from the Lord, not: the Lord himself has (directly, personally, in an *ἐκκοκλῶσις*) communicated it to me; *παρὰ*, which some uncial Codd. give, is undoubtedly a correction; see Schulz, as above, 215 ff.; cf. N. theol. Annal. 1818. II. 820 ff.

² The Codd. occasionally vary between *ἀπό* and *ὑπό*, as in Mark viii. 31; Rom. xiii. 1, which is frequently the case in those of Greek authors also, *Schaeff. Melet. p. 22, 83 sq.*

well as in Greek authors¹) e.g. Acts xxiii. 21 τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν (see above, § 30, 3, note 5), Rom. xiii. 1 οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ θεοῦ (immediately followed by αἱ δὲ οὐσαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν), Matt. xvi. 21 παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (Lucian. dial. deor. 6, 5; Plat. Phaed. 83 b.), Mark xv. 45 γινῶνς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος, Matt. xii. 38 θέλομεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν, Acts ix. 13; Gal. i. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 13; 1 Jno. ii. 20; iv. 21; Col. iii. 24; 2 Thess. i. 9, — and, abstractly, the efficient power itself, and may therefore be rendered *through*, Acts xx. 9 κατενεχθεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου, Rev. ix. 18. Further, it signifies the *occasion*, Acts xi. 19 (Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 128, 598; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 180), and the *motive*, Matt. xiv. 26 ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν *for fear*, xiii. 44; Luke xxi. 26; xxii. 45; xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14; Plutarch. Lysand. 23; Vig. p. 581, — the (objective) cause, *propter*, Matt. xviii. 7 (according to some Heb. v. 7 also; see Bleek), or *proae* (in negative expressions), Acts xxii. 11 οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτός *on account of* (for) *the splendor* (his not seeing arose *from* the splendor), Luke xix. 3; Jno. xxi. 6, see Kypke in loc. (Acts xxviii. 3 var.), cf. Held, Plut. Tim. 314 (Judith

Schweighaeuser, Lexic. Polyb. p. 69, and others. Further, we find ἀπὸ for ἐκ ἀπὸ after Passives in later writers more and more frequently (especially in the Byzantines; see e.g. Index to Malalas in the Bonn edit.); in earlier authors this interchange is on the whole rare, yet see Poppo ad Thuc. III. I. 158; *Bhdy.* 224.

¹ In Jas. i. 13 ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι means simply, *I am tempted* (through influences proceeding) *from God*, and is a more vague expression than ἐκ θεοῦ πειράζει με. The words that follow, πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδὲνα, merely show that the apostle has also in mind a direct temptation by God (cf. *Hm. Soph. Oed. Col.* 1531; *Schoemann*, Plutarch. Cleom. p. 237); the phrase ἀπὸ θεοῦ is very frequently a sort of Adverb, *divinitus*. In Luke vi. 18 the words πνευμ. ἀκαθ. signify the malady itself; had the expression been e.g. δαλούμενοι ἀπὸ νόσων, it would have presented no difficulty. In Luke ix. 22; xvii. 25, ἀποδοκιμάζεσθαι ἀπὸ is simply: to be rejected *on the part of* the elders. That in Acts xii. 20 διὰ τὸ τρέφεσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν χάριν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς (Arist. pol. 4, 6) ἀπὸ is not used instead of ἐκ, is quite obvious. *Schneckenburger*, ad Jac. i. 13, who asserts that it is, has in general not discriminated with sufficient care. As to Matt. xi. 19 see *Fr.* in loc. and *Lehmann*, Lucian. VI. 544; 2 Cor. vii. 13 does not at all come under this head; ἀπὸ there means *from* (through influence proceeding *from*). In Acts x. 17 (text. rec.) of ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορηλίου (Arrian. Epict. 3, 22. 23) is simply: those sent *from C.*, the deputation *from C.*; whereas ἀπεστ. ἐκ (which some Codd. [Sin. also] give as a correction) would be more definite: those whom he (in person) had sent; cf. 1 Thess. iii. 6 ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν (they had not sent him). In 1 Cor. i. 30 ὅς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ *who became to us wisdom from God*, ἐκ is not necessary, cf. Her. 5, 125 (see also Stallb. Plat. rep. 103). Finally, in Jas. v. 4 ὁ μισθὸς δὲ ἀπεστειρημένος ἀφ' ὑμῶν, probably ἀπὸ was used designedly: *on your part, by you* (though not solely or directly). (Both prepositions occur together in significations obviously different in Luke v. 15 according to some Codd. and in Rom. xiii. 1, cf. Euseb. H. E. 2, 6, p. 115, *Heinichen*.)

ii. 20; Gen. xxxvi. 7 etc.; Her. 2, 64). Acts xvi. 33 is a pregnant construction: ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν he *washed* and cleansed them *from their stripes*, i.e. from the blood with which they were covered in consequence of the blows. Matt. vii. 16 is evidently, *from their fruits* (objectively) will the knowledge be *derived* (Arrian. Epict. 4, 8, 10), — (the case is different in Luke xxi. 30 ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν γινώσκετε, 2 Cor. x. 7, where the *subjective* power whence the knowledge comes is indicated; ἀφ' ἐαυτοῦ, indeed, often signifying *sponte*).

Schleusner and Kühnöl maintain that ἀπό denotes also 1) *in*, Acts 333 xv. 38 τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας who had left them *in* Pamphylia. But the obvious meaning is: *who had left them* (as they 390 were proceeding) *out of Pamphylia*. This is quite different from ἐν Π, 349 which might have implied that Marcus remained *in* P. but separated from 7th ed. Paul, cf. xiii. 13. 2) *de*, Acts xvii. 2 διελέγετο αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν; but this means: *starting* (in his discourses) *from* the Scriptures, or drawing his arguments *from* the Scriptures (cf. Epiphan. Opp. II. 340 d.); cf. Acts xxviii. 23. Nor is the signification *de* supported by Her. 4, 53. 195 (Schweighaeuser, Lexic. Herod. I. 77). 3) *per*, Acts xi. 19 διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως, which however means *owing to the persecution*, the persecution being the occasion or incidental cause. 4) *modo, instar*, 2 Tim. i. 3 ἀπὸ προγόνων, see also Flatt in loc. The phrase signifies, *from my forefathers* (Polyb. 5, 55, 9), with the sentiments inherited from them. On such passages as Jno. xi. 18; Rev. xiv. 20 see § 61, 5 remark p. 557.

c. Ἀμφί does not occur in the N. T.

d. Πρὸ *before* (in a wider sense than ἀντί), *locally* in Acts v. 23; Jas. v. 9, also Acts xiv. 13, cf. Helioid. 1, 11, 30; Boeckh, Corp. inscript. II. 605. It is more frequently used *temporally*, either with nouns of time, 2 Tim. iv. 21 πρὸ χειμῶνος, Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 2; Matt. viii. 29, and the Inf. of verbs, Matt. vi. 8; Jno. i. 49, or with personal pronouns and names of persons, Jno. v. 7 πρὸ ἐμοῦ, x. 8; Rom. xvi. 7. It is used *figuratively* in Jas. v. 12 πρὸ πάντων *ante omnia*, 1 Pet. iv. 8 (Xen. M. 2, 5, 3; Herod. 5, 4, 2). As to the original use of this preposition, explaining its construction with the Gen., see Bhdy. p. 231.

e. Περί. The fundamental meaning of this preposition may be discerned in its construction with the Dative. With that case it denotes *encircling, shutting in*, on several or on all sides (closely related to ἀμφί, which signifies shutting in on both sides). Hence it is different from παρά, which merely indicates that one object is *near to, beside* another. Περί with the Gen. is used in prose

almost exclusively in a figurative sense (yet cf. Odyss. 5, 68),¹ to designate an object as the *centre* of activity, around which the activity is conceived as moving, — e.g. *contending, drawing lots, caring, about* anything, Matt. vi. 28; Mark xiii. 32; Jno. x. 13; xix. 24;² and then quite usually *deciding, knowing, hearing, speaking, about, concerning* (de, super), see above, p. 361. At other times it is to be rendered by *for* (as pray *for* one), Jno. 334 xvi. 26; Acts viii. 15; Heb. xiii. 18; Luke xix. 37; 1 Thess. i. 2; ^{6th ed.} or *on account of*, Jno. xv. 22; Acts xv. 2; xxv. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18 (although many traces of *about* are to be discerned in these cases), 350 or *in reference to*, Matt. iv. 6; Rom. xv. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 1; Jno. ^{7th ed.} vii. 17; Demosth. Ol. 1, § 11. In the last sense *περί* with its substantive is put at the beginning of a sentence in appearance absolutely, as an exponendum (Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 157 and Tim. p. 97), 1 Cor. xvi. 1 *περί τῆς λογίας* etc. *quod ad pecunias attinet*, although these words are grammatically connected with *ὥςπερ διέταξα*; and still more perceptibly in 1 Cor. xvi. 12 *περὶ Ἀπολλῶ, πολλὰ παρεκάλεσα αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς* etc. (cf. Papyri Taur. 1, 6, 31; *de* is similarly used e.g. in Cic. fam. 3, 12). Sometimes *περί* appears to signify superiority, *over and above, prae*, as in the Homeric *περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων* (Bhdy. 260).³ Some (Beza) have taken it in this sense in 3 Jno. 2 *περὶ πάντων εὐχομαί σε* etc. *above all* (Schott); Lücke, in support of this explanation, quotes a passage from Dion. H. II. 1412 (where, however, *περὶ ἀπάντων* means *in reference to* etc.). Still, it seems to me that the impossibility of connecting *περὶ πάντ.* with the Infinitives which follow (Bengel and BCrus. in loc.) has not yet been shown.

f. *Πρός*. The meaning *from* (something) *hitherwards*, which accords with the primary force of the Genitive, flows from its *local*

¹ That the *local* sense *around* is not without example in (later) prose writers, has been shown by Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 269; cf. Schaef. Dion. comp. 351. Accordingly, in Acts xxv. 18 *περὶ οὗ* might be joined with *σταθέντες* (as is done by Mey.), cf. vs. 7 *περιέστησαν οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβεβηκόρες Ἰουδαῖοι*.

² Verbs of *caring for*, etc. are construed also with *ὑπέρ*, see *ὑπέρ*, below. As to the distinction between the two constructions, Weber, Demosth. p. 130 says: *περὶ* solam mentis circumspectionem vel respectum rei, *ὑπέρ* simul animi propensionem etc. significat. Verbs of *contending* (*about* or *for* anything) have the same double construction. Hence in one and the same passage *περὶ* and *ὑπέρ* are sometimes contrasted, Franke, Demosth. p. 6 sq.

³ Even here, however, as the construction was originally viewed the preposition undoubtedly bears the signification *around*. *Surpassing around* all is he who by his superiority so encircles, as it were, all, that no one can emerge from the mass. *Before* all marks the relation only on *one* side; *περὶ*, on all sides.

use, Hm. Vig. p. 863, and is evident also from examples like τὸ ποιούμενον πρὸς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων Her. 7, 209, πᾶσχομεν πρὸς αὐτῆς Alciaphr. 1, 20 (Bhdy. 264) and εἶναι πρὸς τινος *to be on one's side*, cf. ad Herenn. 2, 27 *ab reo facere*. Hence πρὸς ἐμοῦ, like *e re nostra*, to my advantage, according to my interest, Lob. Phryn. 20; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 265. Πρὸς in this sense gives way in the N. T. to ἀπό and ἐκ; it is used only once, Acts xxvii. 34 τοῦτο (taking nourishment) πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει *is for* (conducive to) *your deliverance*, strictly, *is on the side*, as it were, of your deliverance. A similar expression occurs in Thuc. 3, 59 οὐ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας δόξης non cedet vobis in gloriam.

- 392 g. Ἐπὶ. The primary import of ἐπὶ, which might justify its being used with the Gen., has almost disappeared, unless we choose to translate e.g. Luke iv. 29 ὅρους, ἐφ' οὗ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν ὠκοδόμητο *up from which* (on which upwards) was built (D. Sic. 3, 47; Polyb. 10, 10, 5). Usually ἐπὶ indicates the being *upon*, *above*, a place (point or level), whether the object is regarded as at rest or in motion,¹ Matt. x. 27 κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων, xxiv. 30 ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν, ix. 2, 6; Acts v. 15; viii. 28; Rev. xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 10; Luke xxii. 21, especially ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (opposed to ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) cf. Xen. An. 3, 2, 19; Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 15. Applied to waters, it may refer not merely to their surface, Rev. v. 13 ἐπὶ τ. θαλάσσης,² but also to their coasts or banks (cf. Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 10) Jno. xxi. 1 ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης *by the sea, on the sea-shore* (Polyb. 1, 44, 4; Xen. An. 4, 3, 28; 2 Kings ii. 7, cf. the Hebrew בַּיָּם). It is further applied to elevated objects (up) *on* which something is placed e.g. *on the cross* Acts v. 30; Jno. xix. 19. On the other hand, the local sense of *beside*, *near*,³ alleged in N. T. Lexicons,

¹ Wittmann, de natura et potest. praep. ἐπὶ. Schweinf. 1846. 4to. In most cases the Latin language employs *in* for it. The German *auf*, which is applied both to heights and to plains, corresponds to the Greek word in many respects. Mark viii. 4 ἐπ' ἐρημίας entirely resembles the German *auf dem Felde*, though we do not employ *auf* in that particular phrase. Cf. Matt. iv. 1 ἀνέχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.

² Here belongs also Jno. vi. 19 (it seems that in Matt. xiv. 25 ἐπὶ τὴν θάλα. must be read) περιπατεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλά. *to walk on the sea*, cf. Lucian. philops. 13 βαδίζειν ἐφ' ἑδάτος, vera hist. 2, 4 ἐπὶ τοῦ πελάγους διαθέντες (Job ix. 8). *By itself* ἐπὶ τ. θαλά. might indeed also be translated *on the edge of the sea*. This assuredly Fr. Mt. p. 502 did not mean to deny.

³ Even in the case of things on the same level, the Greek, by a conventional or ethical conception which we not seldom share, speaks of an *above*. *Above the door* (Her. 5, 92) might, for instance, be applied to a person who stands near the door *inside the room*; on the other hand, *under the door* to one *outside*, at the door. Cf. as to the kindred ἐπὶ Bhdy. S. 243. The relation is conceived very differently in different languages.

cannot be certainly established. In Luke xxii. 40 *τόπος* refers to a hill (though we also say *on* the spot); in Matt. xxi. 19 *ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ* means *on* the way; in Acts xx. 9 *ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος* is *upon* the window; in Jno. vi. 21 *τὸ πλοῖον ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* is used of the landing of a vessel, and *ἐπὶ* refers to the rising shore; yet see what has been said before.

The figurative meanings of *ἐπὶ* are quite plain. It is used,

a) Of authority and superintendence *over* etc.; as, Matt. ii. 22 *βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίας*, Rev. xi. 6; Acts viii. 27 *εἶναι ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γᾶς*, vi. 3; xii. 20; Rom. ix. 5 *εἶναι ἐπὶ πάντων*, Eph. iv. 6; 393 cf. Polyb. 1, 34, 1; 2, 65, 9; Arrian. Al. 3, 5, 4; Reitz, Lucian. VI. 448 Bip.; Schaef. Demosth. II. 172; Held, Plutarch. Timol. 388.

b) Of the subject, the ground-work as it were, of an action; as, Jno. vi. 2 *σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων* which he wrought *on* the sick (cf. Mtth. 1368); particularly of speaking, Gal. iii. 16 *οὗ λέγει . . . ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν* as *of* (upon) many (speaking of many), cf. scribere, disserere *super* re, and Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 2, 24; 6, 25; Epict. ench. 3; Heind. Plat. Charm. 62; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 114; Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 76; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 436.

c) Of presence, *before* (coram), particularly before judges, magistrates, etc. (in the phrase bring *up before*), Matt. xxviii. 14; [Mark xiii. 9]; Acts xxiii. 30; xxiv. 20; xxv. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 13 (cf. Ael. 8, 2; Lucian. catapl. 16; Dio. C. p. 825; Schoem. Isae. 293); and then in general, 1 Tim. v. 19 *ἐπὶ μαρτύρων before* (with) witnesses (Xen. Hell. 6, 5, 38; vectig. 3, 14; Lucian. philops. 22; Mätzner, Antiph. p. 165);¹ also 2 Cor. vii. 14 (before, i.e. in presence of, Titus), see Wetst. I. 443, 562; Schaef. Melet. p. 105. 336

d) In a related sense, with names of persons, of *the reign*, Acts ^{6th ed.} xi. 28 *ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου under* Claudius, Mark ii. 26 (Raphel. and ³⁵² Fr. in loc.), Luke iii. 2 (Her. 1, 15; Aeschin. dial. 3, 4; Xen. C. ^{7th ed.} 8, 4, 5, etc.; Bremi, Demosth. p. 165; Schweigh. Lexic. Herod. I. 243; Sturz, Lexic. Dion. Cass. p. 148); likewise simply of the lifetime (*ἐπ' ἐμοῦ* in my time), especially of prominent characters, Luke iv. 27 *ἐπὶ Ἑλισσαίου* (Xen. C. 1, 6, 31; Plat. rep. 10, 599 e.; Crit. 112 a.; Alciph. 1, 5 *ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων*, Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 27); also with words denoting conditions and events (Xen. C. 8, 7, 1; Herod. 2, 9, 7) Matt. i. 11 *ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβ.* *at the time of the exile*; lastly, directly of time, Heb. i. 1 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου*

¹ The phrase in full would be, *ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων* etc. Matt. xviii. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 1 (after the Hebrew מִפִּי שְׁנֵי עֲדָוִים). Even here, strictly, *ἐπὶ* means simply *with*: *with (on) the testimony of . . . witnesses*.

τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων *in* these last days, 1 Pet. i. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 3, cf. Num. xxiv. 14; Gen. xlix. 1 (ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων Aristot. polit. 3, 10; Polyb. 1, 15, 12; Isocr. paneg. c. 44); and in general, of that with which something else is connected, Rom. i. 10 ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου *at* (in) my prayers, 1 Thess. i. 2; Eph. i. 16. The import of ἐπὶ is not quite the same in Mark xii. 26 ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου *at* the bush, i.e. concisely, at the passage relating to the bush.

- 394 Sometimes ἐπὶ in a local sense is also used with verbs of direction, and even with verbs of motion (Bhdy. 246) *to, towards, forth upon*; as, Matt. xxvi. 12 βαλοῦσα τὸ μύρον ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος *on* (over) *my body*, Acts x. 11 σκεῦός τι . . . καθιέμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς *let down on* (to) *the earth*, Mark xiv. 35 ἐπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς *upon the earth*, Heb. vi. 7. So very frequently in Greek authors, Her. 1, 164; 2, 73. 75. 119; 4, 14; 5, 33; Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 1, and Hellen. 1, 6, 20; 3, 4, 12; 5, 3, 6; 7, 1, 28 etc.; Sturz, Lexic. Xen. II. 258; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 339; Wittmann, de natura et potestate praepositionis ἐπί. Schweinfurt, 1846. 4to. In this application ἐπὶ originally includes the notion of remaining *on, upon*, see Rost 553 (somewhat differently explained in Krü. 302).¹ Such passages as Rev. x. 2; Luke viii. 16; Jno. xix. 19; Acts v. 15 (τιθέναι ἐπὶ τοῦ etc.) are traceable, like ponere *in loco*, to a different view of the action.

- h. Μετά properly signifies *among, amidst* (μέσος), Luke xxiv. 5 τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; Mark i. 13. Hence it denotes *with* (together with), Luke v. 30 μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν ἐσθίετε, Jno. xx. 7; and that in reference to personal association, Jno. iii. 22; xviii. 2; Acts ix. 39; Matt. xii. 42; Heb. xi. 9,² and alternate action, Jno. iv. 27 λαλεῖν μετὰ τινος, vi. 43 γογγύζειν μετ' ἀλλήλων, Matt. xviii. 23 συναίρειν λόγον μετὰ τινος, cf. Rev. ii. 16, 22; Luke 353 xii. 13; especially if intellectual or moral, Matt. xx. 2 συμφωνεῖν 7th ed. μετὰ τινος, ii. 3; Luke xxiii. 12; Acts vii. 9; Rom. xii. 15; 1 Jno. i. 6 (εἶναι μετὰ τινος Matt. xii. 30, cf. Xen. C. 2, 4, 7); sometimes 337 where we should employ *on* or *towards*, erga, as Luke x. 37 ὁ ποιήσας 6th ed. τὸ ἔλεος μετ' ἐμοῦ, i. 72 (εἰς; probably not Acts xiv. 27), for we regard the individual towards whom kindness is shown as the object, not as the partner, of the act. But μετὰ is applied also to things, Luke xiii. 1 ὡν τὸ αἷμα ἔμικεν μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν, Matt.

¹ This distinction was perceived by so early a writer as Bengel (on Heb. vi. 7).

² Under this head comes also the Hebraistic πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου Acts ii. 28 Sept. (פְּלִיטָה לְפָנָיו), which must not be taken in a merely local signification.

xxvii. 34, especially to express equipment, accompaniment, environment, Luke xxii. 52 ἐξεληλύθατε μετὰ μαχαίρων, Jno. xviii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 31 (Dem. Pantaen. p. 628 c.; Herod. 5, 6, 19); then of accompanying actions and circumstances, particularly states of mind (Bhdy. 255), Heb. xii. 17 μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας (Herod. 1, 16, 10), 1 Tim. iv. 14; Matt. xiv. 7; Mark x. 30; Acts v. 26; xvii. 11 ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας, Matt. xiii. 20; xxviii. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 15 (Eurip. Hippol. 205; Soph. Oed. C. 1636; Alciplhr. 3, 38; Arist. magn. Mor. 2, 6; Herod. 1, 5, 19); lastly, 395 of the inward connection of spiritual objects, Eph. vi. 23 ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως. In good prose μετὰ never designates the *instrument* as such (Kypke I. 143),¹ — in 1 Tim. iv. 14 μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν is *with*, *amid*, the laying on of hands (simultaneously with the act of imposition), Matt. xiv. 7 μεθ' ὄρκου interposito jurejurando (Heb. vii. 21) — yet it borders on this signification in Luke xvii. 15 μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης δοξάζων (essentially equivalent to φωνῇ μεγάλῃ or ἐν φωνῇ μ.), and perhaps in Acts xiii. 17;² (cf. Polyb. 1, 49, 9 ἤθροιξε μετὰ κηρύγματος, Lucian. philops. 8 βοηθεῖν τι μετὰ τῆς τέχνης, as σύν is used in other writers, at least in poets, Bhdy. S. 214). As to Matt. xxvii. 66, however, see Fr. It never signifies *after*;³ in Mark x. 30 μετὰ διωγμῶν is *amid* persecutions, as μετὰ κινδύνων is *amid* dangers, Thuc. 1, 18 a. Kühnöl and BCrus. erroneously render μετὰ with the Gen. in Matt. xii. 41 by *contra*; the meaning is: the men of Nineveh will appear at the judgment *with* this generation, i.e. when this generation appears before the judgment-seat, the Ninevites will appear also; for what purpose (*against*) we are first told by the words that follow. (The use of the Gen. with μετὰ is accounted for by the fact that whatever attends or surrounds any one bears to him a certain relation of dependence.)

i. Διά. Its primary meaning is *through*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12 (Plat. Phaed. 109 c.); but with the idea of *going through* is connected always, in the local sense, that of *going forth* or *out from* (thus in 354 Hebrew and Arabic 70 is the only preposition for the local *through*; 7th ed. cf. also Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 191 ἐκφεύγειν δι' αἰῶνος, Matt iv. 4

¹ The meaning of μετὰ λύχνου Fabric. Pseudepigr. II. 143 is: *with a light*, i.e. furnished with a light, carrying it with him, *cum lumine*, not *lumine*. On the other hand, cf. Leo Gramm. p. 260 μαχαίριον ἐπιφέρεται βουλόμενος ἀνελεῖν σε μετ' αὐτοῦ, p. 275 etc.

² Yet μετὰ here is probably to be understood of the accompaniment: *with upraised arm*, as he held up his arm over them (to protect them).

³ Fabric. Pseudepigr. II. 593 μετὰ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν is undoubtedly an error in transcribing, for τὸ ἐλθεῖν. Further, the passages collected by Raphel. Mr. l.c. prove nothing.

ἐκπορεύεσθαι διὰ from Deut. viii. 3, and διεξέρχεσθαι Plat. rep. 338 10, 621 a.);¹ hence διὰ governs the Genitive. It is applied to space ^{6th ed.} in simple expressions, Luke iv. 30 αὐτὸς διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο (Herod. 2, 1, 3), 1 Cor. iii. 15 σωθήσεται . . . ὡς διὰ πυρός, Rom. xv. 28 ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν i.e. *through* your city (Thuc. 5, 4; Plut. virt. mul. p. 192 Lips.), Acts xiii. 49 διεφέρετο ὁ λόγος δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας *from one extremity to the other* 396 (*throughout*, Odys. 12, 335; Plat. symp. p. 220 b.), 2 Cor. viii. 18 οὐ ὁ ἔπαινος . . . διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

From this local *through*, in Greek as in all languages, the transition is easy to the instrument (whether animate or inanimate), as that *through* which the effect as it were passes (cf. in particular 1 Pet. i. 7), that which intervenes between the volition and the deed, e.g. 3 Jno. 13 οὐ θέλω διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμου γράφειν, 2 Jno. 12 (Plut. vit. Solon. p. 87 e.), 2 Cor. vi. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 2 διὰ λόγου, δι' ἐπιστολῆς, by word of mouth, by letter, Heb. xiii. 22 διὰ βραχείων ἐπέστεila ὑμῖν *raucis scripsi vobis*, see § 64; thence it is applied to immaterial objects, as in 1 Cor. vi. 14 ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, Rom. iii. 25 ὃν προέθετο ἰλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως, Rom. ii. 12; Jas. ii. 12 κρίνεσθαι διὰ νόμου; to persons, as in Acts iii. 16 ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor. iii. 5 διάκονοι, δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε, Heb. iii. 16 οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωϋσέως. Thus in particular in the expression διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of the (mediatorial) agency of Christ in all its manifestations, Rom. ii. 16; v. 1; 2 Cor. i. 5; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 5; Phil. i. 11; Tit. iii. 6 etc.,² as also in διὰ πνεύματος (ἀγίου) Rom. v. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 8; Eph. iii. 16. To this (instrumental) use may be referred likewise 2 Tim. ii. 2 διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων *intervenientibus multis testibus*, *through the interposition* i.e. here in the presence of many witnesses, Heb. vii. 9 διὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Λευὶ δεδεκάτωται *through* Abraham (that is, in the person of Abraham as representative of the whole Israelitish people, when Abraham was tithed Levi also was tithed). Διὰ but rarely indicates the *causa principalis*,³ 1 Cor.

¹ Cf. Kühner II. 281 and my 5th Progr. de verbis composit. p. 3.

² This expression comes essentially under the same head when it is joined to *praising*, *thanking*, etc. Rom. i. 8; vii. 25; xvi. 27; Col. iii. 17. Not merely the benefits for which thanks are offered are procured through Christ, but even the thanksgiving itself is offered (if so as to be acceptable to God) through Christ who lives with God and continues the work of mediation for his people. The Christian does not give thanks in his proper person, but through Christ, whom he regards as the mediator of his prayer as well as of salvation. *Philippi* on Rom. i. 8 is unsatisfactory; *Bengel* on the same passage is better.

³ As to the Latin *per* for *a*, see *Hand*, Tursell. IV. 436 sq. *The wrong done through*

i. 9 (Gal. iv. 7 var.), in other words but rarely seems to be equivalent to *ὑπό* or *παρά*; but even in such cases it does not designate the author as such, i.e. as the one *from* whom something proceeds, but rather as the person *through* whose effort, or kindness etc. something accrues to one cf. Gal. i. 1 (without specifying whether it flows *from* him directly or indirectly).¹ We may add with Fr. (Rom. I. 15): *est autem hic usus ibi tantum admissus, ubi nullam sententiae ambiguitatem crearet*; thus in Gal. i. 1, after the discriminating use of *ὑπό* and *διά*, *διά* alone is employed in summing up, and employed too of God. Many passages, however, have been erroneously referred to this class: in Jno. i. 3, 17 the doctrine of the Logos justifies the *per* of mediate agency, cf. Origen in loc. (Tom. I. 108 Lommatzsch); in Rom. i. 5 *δι' οὗ* is explained from xv. 15; Rom. xi. 36, owing to the prepositions *ἐκ* and *εἰς*, admits no other interpretation; on Gal. iii. 19 see my Comment.; in Rom. v. 2 nobody will be misled by Fr's. remarks; in Heb. ii. 3 Christ is viewed as commissioned by God to proclaim salvation; as to 1 Pet. ii. 14 see Steiger in loc.²

To the idea of instrumentality *διά* can also be referred when used of the state of mind in which one does something, e.g. *δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδέχασθαι, τρέχειν* Rom. viii. 25; Heb. xii. 1; Plut. educ. 5, 3;³ probably also 2 Cor. v. 7 *διὰ πίστεως περιπατοῦμεν*. Hence *διά* serves as a circumlocution for an adjective, 2 Cor. iii. 11 *εἰ τὸ καταργούμενον (ἐστὶ) διὰ δόξης* (i.e. *ἐνδοξον*) Mtth. II. 1353. *Διά* is more loosely used of one's equipment, and of the circumstances

me, and the wrong done by me, may on the whole express quite the same thing; yet the wrong-doer is viewed in these expressions under two different aspects. Probably *διὰ* is employed purposely in Matt. xxvi. 24 *τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται* (the betrayer was merely an instrument, cf. Rom. viii. 32) and in Acts ii. 43 *πολλὰ τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγένετο*, as the efficient cause was God himself (Acts ii. 22; xv. 12), cf. *διὰ χειρῶν* v. 12; xiv. 3. That this more precise mode of expression is not observed everywhere and by all writers does not invalidate this exposition.

¹ Nearly to the same effect is the remark of *Bremi* on Corn. Nep. 10, 1, 4. Even conceded that *διὰ* and *ὑπό* are wholly identical, it would not follow that Gal. iii. 19 (*νόμος*) *διαταγὰς δι' ἀγγέλων* represents the angels as *authors* of the Mosaic Law (as *Schulthess* persisted in asserting). To justify any departure from the plain meaning—*ordained through angels*—far other and more solid reasons must be assigned than those urged by *Schulthess*.

² At first sight *τίνας παραγγελίας ἰδὼκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* 1 Thess. iv. 2 appears strange. But as the Apostle was not acting in his private capacity, but as moved by Christ, the charges he issued were properly charges given through Christ.

³ Xen. C. 4, 6, 6 is of a different sort. Also in 2 Cor. ii. 4 *ἐγγραφα ὑμῖν διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων* is, properly, *through many tears*. *Amid many tears* is an expression somewhat similar; see above, *μετὰ* p. 376 sq.

and relations under which he does something, e.g. 1 Jno. v. 6 *ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος came by means of water and blood*, Heb. ix. 12 (yet see Bleek in loc.), Rom. ii. 27 *σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην ὄντα with letter and circumcision*, i.e. notwithstanding that thou wast in possession of a written law etc., 356 iv. 11; xiv. 20 *ὁ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίων he who eateth with offence* (giving offence), (Markland, Lys. V. 329 Reisk.). 7th ed. 398

Applied to *time*, διὰ denotes, a) *During* (i.e. within a space of time), Heb. ii. 15 *διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν* (Xen. Cyr. 2, 1, 19; Mem. 340 1, 2, 61; Plat. conv. 203 d.); even though the action takes place 6th ed. but once or occasionally within the period mentioned, as in Acts v. 19; xvi. 9 etc. (of which laxer use no instances are to be found in literary Greek, Fr. in Fritzsche. Opusc. p. 164 sq.).

b) *After*,¹ as δι' ἐτῶν πλειόνων Acts xxiv. 17, properly *interjectis* pluribus annis, *many years intervening*,² i.e. after the lapse of many years (see Perizon. Aelian. p. 921 ed. Gronov.; Blomfield, Aesch. Pers. 1006; Wetst. I. 525, 558), and Gal. ii. 1, cf. Her. 6, 118; Plat. legg. 8, 834 e.; Arist. anim. 8, 15; Polyb. 22, 26, 22; Geopon. 14, 26, 2; Plutarch. Agis 10; Lucian. Icar. 24, also Sept. Deut. ix. 11. Lastly, Mark ii. 1 δι' ἡμερῶν *after* (some) *days* (Theophr. plant. 4, 4 δι' ἡμερῶν *τωνων*), cf. διὰ χρόνου Plat. Euthyd. 273 b.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 28 (Raphel, Kypke, and Fr. in loc.).

The following significations have been erroneously attributed to διὰ:

a. *Into* (in with the Acc.): 1 Cor. xiii. 12 βλέπομεν δι' ἐσόπτρου is said agreeably to a popular notion; the look passes *through* the mirror, inasmuch as the form appears to be standing behind the mirror.

b. *Cum*: 1 Cor. xvi. 3 δι' ἐπιστολῶν τούτους πέμψω ἀπενεγκεῖν etc. is to be rendered, *by means of* letters, so as to recommend them by letters (Syriac ܕܝܠܬܐ). To be sure, the Apostle means at the same time

¹ No one will deny this signification who is not trying to find in the above passage of Gal. confirmation of his own previous decision respecting the chronology of Paul's travels. That the preposition can have this meaning becomes plain, whether, with *Muh.* 1352, we derive it from the notion of distance which διὰ in a local sense denotes, or from the notion of passing through a succession of points of time (which are thereby indicated as travelled through, gone over), *Hm.* Vig. 856. The assertion that διὰ is thus applied only to a period of time after which something occurs as its *result*, is a subtilty which has no foundation in usage, and a misapplication of the notion of *means* (itself figurative) to explain a temporal use of the preposition, — a use always most closely connected with its local and primary import. Even, however, were the alleged restriction to be admitted, it would not be impossible to apply the expression διὰ δεκατ. ἐτῶν in Gal. ii. 1 to a journey the necessity of which Paul felt *in consequence* of an active ministry of fourteen years. At least, κατὰ ἀποκάλ. in vs. 2 could not be urged as a decisive argument on the other side.

² Her. 3, 157 διαλειπὼν ἡμέρας δέκα, Isocr. perm. p. 746:

that they themselves should take the letters *with* them; but still the import of the Preposition is strictly preserved.

c. *Ad*: 2 Pet. i. 3 καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς is not *ad relig.* Christ. adduxit eo consilio, ut consequeremini felicitatem etc., but called us by (means of) glory and might, so that in this call God's power and 399 majesty were exhibited (vs. 4, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9). Some Codd. [Sin. also] give δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ.

d. *On account of*, for διὰ with the Acc. (only thus in very late writers, e.g. Acta apocr. p. 252): In 2 Cor. ix. 13 διὰ denotes rather the occasion 357 which gives rise to the δοξάζειν; whereas what follows, ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ, 7th ed. means, *for* i.e. *on account of* the obedience. In 1 Cor. i. 21 οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν may very well be rendered: *by means of* their (boasted vs. 20) wisdom (it did not conduct them to this result); though the interpretation of others, *in consequence of* (sheer) wisdom, if taken thus: by the possession of wisdom (see above), is grammatically 341 admissible. But διὰ τῆς μωρίας which immediately follows is decisive in 7th ed. favor of the former explanation. Rom. vii. 4 ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ is elucidated by verses 1-3: Ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; with the death of the body of Christ (which had reference to the law) ye are made dead (slain) to the law. That in 1 Cor. xi. 12 διὰ τῆς γυναικός is not used for διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα (which would introduce here an extraneous thought) is the more clear from the circumstance that it is manifestly to be taken as corresponding to ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός; the distinction between ἐκ and διὰ is obvious. In 2 Cor. viii. 8 (Schott) διὰ τῆς ἐτέρ. σπουδῆς is to be joined to δοκιμάζων, see Bengel. Heb. xi. 39 (Schott) πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως is, *who through the faith have obtained a good report*. Likewise the rendering *per* (Schott) in exhortations and adjurations (*by*), Rom. xii. 1; xv. 30; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 12, is entirely unfounded. To *exhort* or *adjure* one *through* the mercies of God, *through* the name of Christ, means: referring to, reminding of etc.; διὰ indicates the consideration held out to strengthen the exhortation.

k. *Κατά*. Its primary import is *down, de* (down upon, down from), cf. κάτω (Xen. A. 4, 2, 17 ἀλλόμενοι κατὰ τῆς πέτρας, 1, 5, 8 τρέχειν κατὰ πρανοῦς γηλόφου, Her. 8, 53): Matt. viii. 32 ὥρμησε πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ (Galen. protrept. 2 κατὰ κρημνῶν, Dio Chr. 7, 99; Porphy. abstin. 4, 15; Aelian. 7, 14; Pausan. 10, 2, 2), 1 Cor. xi. 4 ἀνὴρ κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων having (a veil hanging) down from his head; cf. also, in a tropical use, 2 Cor. viii. 2 ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία poverty reaching down to the depth.¹ It

¹ To the same head is to be referred also Acts xxvii. 14 ἔβαλε κατ' αὐτῆς ἄνεμος τυφωτικός. The tempestuous wind rushed (from above) *down upon* the island. In Mark xiv. 3 κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς (holding the flask of ointment over his

400 passes from this to denote the level *over* (*through*) which something extends; and thus differs essentially from the local *ἐν* (with which by late writers it is often confounded, cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 355), as in Luke iv. 14 ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου, Acts ix. 31, 42; x. 37, cf. Arrian. Alex. 5, 7, 1 and Indic. 13, 6.

Figuratively, it is applied to *hostile* movement directed *against* something, as in Matt. x. 35; xxvii. 1; Acts vi. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 6; xv. 15; Rom. viii. 33 (the opposite of *ὑπέρ* Rom. xi. 2; cf. viii. 34; 2 Cor. xiii. 8); and is the preposition usually employed to express 358 this relation. Yet primarily it seems, like the German *gegen*, to 7th ed. denote merely *thitherwards*; while *ἀντί*, like *contra*, includes the notion of hostility in its local signification even. In *oaths* and *adjurations*, as in Matt. xxvi. 63; Heb. vi. 13, 16, *κατὰ θεοῦ* (Schæf. Long. p. 353 sq.; Bhdy. 238) probably means *down from God*, calling God down, so to speak, as witness or avenger (Krü. 294). Kühner II. 284 takes a different view.

342 1. 'Ἐπέρ, in its local signification, denotes the being *above* (over) 6th ed. a place (properly without immediate contact, Xen. M. 3, 8, 9 ὁ ἥλιος τοῦ θέρους ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν στεγῶν πορευόμενος, Herod. 2, 6, 19); hence in geographical diction the expression *situated above* a place, *imminere urbi*, Xen. A. 1, 10, 12; Thuc. 1, 137 (Dissem, Pind. p. 431). In the N. T. it is used only in a figurative sense:¹ and 1) most nearly approaching its local import in 1 Cor. iv. 6 ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε, if rendered: that one be not puffed up above the other (so that he fancy himself raised above the other); still related also to the local sense, 2) *to the advantage of, for the benefit of, for* (the opposite of *κατά* Mark ix. 40; Rom. viii. 31) any one (die, suffer, pray, care, exert one's self, etc., see 401 Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 164 sq.) Jno. x. 15; xi. 50; Rom. v. 6; ix. 3 (cf. Xen. A. 7, 4, 9; Diod. Sic. 17, 15; Strabo 3, 165; Eurip. Alcest. 700, 711), Luke xxii. 19; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iv. 10; Heb. v. 1; vii. 25; xiii. 17; Col. i. 7, 24, probably also 1 Cor. xv. 29,—originally as if bending *over* one to protect and defend him (cf.

head) good Codd. [Sin. also] omit the preposition. As to *καταχέειν κατά τινος*, see Plat. rep. 3, 398 a.; Apollod. 2, 7, 6.

¹ Unless 1 Cor. xv. 29 βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν be rendered: cause themselves to be baptized *over the dead*. The passage can only be elucidated by antiquarian research. It is strange, however, that *Mey.* should declare the above explanation inadmissible because *ὑπέρ* occurs nowhere else in the N. T. in a *local* sense. Might not the preposition be used in this most simple local sense in a *single* passage only? The comment of *van Hengel*, Cor. p. 136, is worthy of attention, though it, too, contains an arbitrary restriction.

μάχεσθαι ὑπέρ τινος Xen. C. 2, 1, 21; Isocr. paneg. 14);¹ also εἶναι ὑπέρ τινος to be *for* one, Mark ix. 40; Rom. viii. 31; x. 1; Blume, Lycurg. p. 151. In most cases one who acts in behalf of another takes his place, 1 Tim. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 15; hence ὑπέρ is sometimes nearly equivalent to ἀντί *instead, loco* (see, especially, Eurip. Alcest. 700) Philem. 13 (Thuc. 1, 141; Polyb. 3, 67, 7).² 3) Ὑπέρ denotes the subject *on (over)* which one speaks, writes, decides, etc., Rom. ix. 27; Phil. i. 7; 2 Cor. viii. 23 (see Joel i. 3; Plutarch. Brut. 1; Mar. 3; Plat. Apol. 39 e.; legg. 6, 776; Demosth. 359 1. phil. p. 20 a.; Arrian. Al. 3, 11; 6, 2, 6; Arrian. Epict. 1, 7th ed. 19, 26; Polyb. 1, 14, 1; Dion. H. V. 625; Aeschin. dial. 1, 8; Aelian. anim. 11, 20 and often), or *for*, in reference to, which one gives thanks, praise, Eph. i. 16; v. 20; Rom. xv. 9, *on* which one prides one's self, 2 Cor. vii. 4; ix. 2; xii. 5; 2 Thess. i. 4 (cf. in Latin *super*, in Hebrew שָׁר; the phrase *de aliqua re loqui*, too, is akin, see under περί);³ hence in general, *with regard to* a matter, 343 e.g. 2 Cor. i. 6, 8; 2 Thess. ii. 1 ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας 6th ed. τοῦ κυρίου (cf. Xen. C. 7, 1, 17 ὑπὲρ τινος θαρρύνειν to have full confidence in reference to one). Akin to this is the causal signification *on account of, for the sake of*, 2 Cor. xii. 8 (Hebrew שָׁר, yet cf. Latin *gratia*, and Xen. C. 2, 2, 11, and even the German *für*, which often suits such passages and presents the same meaning under different aspects) Rom. xv. 8 ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ (Philostr. Apoll. 1, 35; Xen. A. 1, 7, 3, etc.), under which head come also Jno. xi. 4 ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ *for the glory of God, gloriae divinae illustrandae causa*, 2 Cor. xii. 19 ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς *for your* 402 *edification*, Rom. i. 5; 3 Jno. 7 and, with a difference of application, Phil. ii. 13 θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν . . . ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας *because of his benevolence*, in order to satisfy his benevolence. In 2 Cor. v. 20 ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν . . . δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, probably

¹ Hence properly different from περί, which simply means, *on account of one*, viewed as the object, the cause of the death, the prayer, etc.; see Schaef. Demosth. I. 189 sq.; cf. Reitz, Lucian. VI. 642; VII. 403 sq. ed. Lehm.; Schoem. Isae. p. 234; Franke, Demosth. p. 6 sq. In the Codd. of the N. T., however, as in Greek authors, the two prepositions are frequently interchanged, see on Gal. i. 4, Rom. i. 8, and the writers themselves do not adhere to the distinction. The two prepositions are appropriately used together in 1 Pet. iii. 18 (Eph. vi. 18). Cf. Thuc. 6, 78.

² Still, in doctrinal passages relating to Christ's death (Gal. iii. 13; Rom. v. 6, 8; xiv. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18, etc.) it is not justifiable to render ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν and the like rigorously by *instead of* on account of such parallel passages as Matt. xx. 28 (Fr. Rom. I. 267). Ἀντί is the more definite of the two prepositions. Ὑπέρ signifies merely *for* men, for their deliverance; and leaves undetermined the precise sense in which Christ died *for* them.

³ So with ἀσχεύεσθαι, ἀγανακτείν, etc. Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 119.

ὑπέρ means both times (see de Wette in opposition to Mey.) *for* Christ i.e. in his name and behalf (consequently, in his stead), cf. Xen. C. 3, 3, 14; Plato Gorg. 515 c.; Polyb. 21, 14, 9; Marle floril. p. 169 sq., see above, no. 2) at the end. Others take the second *ὑπέρ* as in solemn asseverations (Bhdy. 244, whose explanation of this use, however, is assuredly erroneous) *by Christ*, per Christum. In Eph. vi. 20 the phrase *πρεσβεύειν ὑπέρ* is used in reference to a thing: to act as an ambassador *for* the gospel (in the cause of the gospel), cf. Dion. H. IV. 2044; Lucian. Toxar. 34.

§ 48. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE DATIVE.

a 'Εν.¹ 1) In its *local* signification (see Spohn, Niceph. Blemmid. p. 29 sqq.), this preposition refers to an expanse within the bounds of which anything exists. Hence, according to different conceptions of the relation, it signifies

360 a) First of all *in* or (when applied to surfaces, heights, etc.)
7th ed. on, Matt. xxiv. 40 *ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ*, xx. 3 *ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ*, Luke xix. 36;
Rev. iii. 21; Jno. iv. 20; 2 Cor. iii. 3. The same relation is frequently expressed by *ἐπὶ* with greater precision.

b) Then (of many) *among*, Matt. xi. 11; Acts ii. 29; iv. 34; xx. 25; Rom. i. 5; 1 Cor. v. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1; ii. 12. With this is connected *ἐν* denoting retinue, Luke xiv. 31 *ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν*
403 *ἀπαντήσαι*, Jude 14 (Neh. xiii. 2; 1 Sam. i. 24; 1 Macc. i. 17);
as well as clothing (and armor, cf. Eph. vi. 16; Krebs, Obs. 26)
344 Matt. vii. 15; Mark xii. 38; Jno. xx. 12 (Aelian. 9, 34; Her. 2,
7th ed. 159; Callim. Dian. 241; Mtth. II. 1340). In a more general use *ἐν* is applied to that with which one is furnished, which he brings with him, Heb. ix. 25 *εἰσέρχεται ἐν αἵματι*, 1 Cor. iv. 21; v. 8; 2 Cor. x. 14; Rom. xv. 29 (Xen. C. 2, 3, 14).

c) Less strictly *in*, *at*, sometimes of direct cohesion, Jno. xv. 4 *κλήμα ἐὰν μὴ μείνῃ ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ*, sometimes of mere proximity (*by*, *παρά*), *καθίζειν (εἶναι) ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ at (on) the right hand*, Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; Eph. i. 20; Plutarch. Lysand. 436 b.; Dio C. 216, 50

¹ 'Εν is used (apparently) with the Gen. in Heb. xi. 26, according to the reading admitted into the text by Lchm. from A and other Codd., *τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν*. Such constructions, by no means rare in Greek authors, must, as is well known, be considered as elliptical: *ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου*. Usually, however, only such words as *νᾶς*, *ἐορτή*, *οἶκος* are omitted; and in the passage in question there is a predominance of authority for *τῶν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν*; [so Sin. also]. As to the most ancient use of this preposition (in Homer), see Gieseke in Schneidewin's Philolog. VII. 77 ff.

(much more frequently thus used in Greek authors, Xen. C. 7, 1, 45; Isocr. panath. p. 646 and Philipp. p. 216; Plat. Charm. 153 b.; Diod. S. 4, 78; 17, 10, cf. comm. on Lucian. VI. 640 Lehm.; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 123).¹ On the other hand, it signifies *in* in Jno. x. 23 and Luke ii. 7, probably also in Jno. viii. 20, where *γαζοφυλάκ.* denotes the treasury as an apartment (or locality), and Luke xiii. 4, as it was usual to say *in* Siloam, because the fountain was surrounded with buildings; perhaps also Matt. xxvii. 5, see Mey. in loc. That in forms of quoting, as *ἐν Δαυὶδ* Heb. iv. 7; Rom. ix. 25 (*in* Cic. or. 71; Quint. 9, 4, 8) and even Rom. xi. 2 *ἐν Ἑλλάδι* (see van Marle and Fr. in loc. cf. Diog. L. 6, 104), *ἐν* should be rendered by *in*, is obvious.

d) *Before, apud, coram* (Isocr. Archid. p. 276; Lysias pro mil. 11; Arrian. Epictet. 3, 22, 8; Ast, Plat. legg. 285), — a rendering, however, which is unnecessary in 1 Tim. iv. 15 (where, besides, *πᾶσιν* must be read without *ἐν*). This meaning, however, it bears in 1 Cor. ii. 6 (xiv. 11), see above, § 31, 8 (cf. Demosth. Boeot. p. 636 a.; Polyb. 17, 6, 1; 5, 29, 6; Appian. civ. 2, 137),² also 1 Cor. vi. 2 *ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος* (in the orators *ἐν ὑμῖν* is often used thus for *apud vos, judices*, see Kypke in loc.), as well as *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τιν.* *before one's eyes (ante oc.)*, see Palair. and 361 Elsner on Matt. xxi. 42 — a phrase used in this passage of the Sept. ^{7th} ed. figuratively.

2) By an easy transition *ἐν* is employed to denote *temporal* 404 relations, where we use sometimes *in*, sometimes *on* (e.g. of festivals) Matt. xii. 2; Jno. ii. 23, sometimes *at* (with a substantive denoting an event) Matt. xxii. 28; 1 Pet. i. 7, also 1 Cor. xv. 52 *ἐν τῇ ἑσχάτῃ σάλπυνγι* *at the last trumpet* (as soon as it sounds), 1 Thess. iv. 16; Heb. iii. 8, and with the Inf. of verbs, Matt. xiii. 25; Luke ix. 36; xvii. 11. Where it signifies *within* (Wex, Soph. Antig. p. 167) Jno. ii. 19 it may also be rendered by *in* (Her. 2, 29), and differs then obviously from *διὰ*; for *ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις* (Plato

¹ To render *ἐν* *in* Heb. ix. 4 by *juxta quam*, would be to favor archæology at the expense of grammar. Where *ἐν* in a local sense is joined to personal names (in the Plur.), it signifies not so much *with* as *among, in the midst of*, (a number, a company, etc.). As to 1 Pet. v. 2 *τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνιον*, Pott's rendering is quite admissible: *the flock existing in the countries where you reside* (cf. *ἐν* Rom. xv. 28). Grammatically it would be possible also to join *τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν* to *ποιμνizare* (quantum in vobis est, as much as in you lies), or, which would undoubtedly be far-fetched, to render *τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνιον* *the flock entrusted to you*, as *εἶναι, κεισθαι ἐν τινι* means, *to rely on, depend on, one*.

² In explaining 1 Cor. as above, Rückert pronounces *ἐν ὑμῖν* exactly the same as *ἐμῶν* — one of those superficial remarks which, so nakedly stated, one could hardly have expected from a scholar at the present day.

345 Menex. 240 b.) does not mean that three whole days are to be
 345^{th ed.} spent on something, but only that something is to take place *within*
 that space of time, consequently before its expiration. Cf. besides,
ἐν ᾧ while, during the time that, Jno. v. 7; Mark ii. 19; Thuc. 6, 55;
 Plato Theaet. 190 e.; Soph. Trach. 925 (*ἐν τούτῳ interea* Xen.
 C. 1, 3, 17; 3, 2, 12), *ἐν οἷς during which* Luke. xii. 1. Closely
 related to the *temporal* signification is the *ἐν* of subsistence (i.e.
 positive and continued existence) Heb. vi. 18 *ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύ-*
σασθαι θεόν whereupon, these two assurances being matters of
 fact, etc., Rom. ii. 12 *ἐν νόμῳ ἡμαρτον under* (during the existence,
 while in possession, of) *the law*; — also of condition, Luke viii. 43
γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος, Rom. iv. 10; Phil. iv. 11 (see Elsner
 in loc.; Kühner II. 274), and that, too, inward, Luke iv. 36; Tit. i. 6,
 particularly of the state of mind or feeling, 1 Tim. ii. 2; 2 Cor.
 ii. 1; viii. 2; Luke i. 44, 75; Eph. i. 4 (Heb. xi. 2); 2 Pet. ii. 3;
 lastly, — the *ἐν* of occupation, 1 Tim. iv. 15 *ἐν τούτοις ἵσθι*, Col.
 iv. 2 cf. Eph. vi. 20 (Mey. in loc.), neut. *ἐν οἷς* Acts xxvi. 12. Cf.
 Xen. C. 3, 1, 1; 5, 2, 17; Soph. Oed. R. 570; Plato Phaed. 59 a.
 and Stallb. in loc.

3) The figurative use of *ἐν*, to which we have already made
 some incidental reference, is extremely diversified, perceptibly
 exhibiting the progressive deterioration of the language as well
 as a Hebrew coloring. For *ἐν* is used to indicate not merely that
 in which something else is (ideally) contained, consists, appears
 1 Pet. iii. 4; Eph. iv. 3 (ii. 15), 2 Thess. ii. 9 (1 Cor. xi. 25),
 Phil. i. 9, but also, with great variety of application,

a) The basis *on* which, or the sphere (range, personal or imper-
 sonal) *in* which, some power acts, 1 Cor. ix. 15 *ἵνα οὕτω* (vs. 13 f.)
γένηται ἐν ἐμοί that it should be so done *on me* (in my case), iv. 2,
 405 6 *ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε* learn *in* us, Jno. xiii. 35 *ἐν τούτῳ γνώσονται*, Xen.
 C. 1, 6, 41 (Luke xxiv. 35; 1 Jno. iii. 19), Rom. xiv. 22 *ὁ μὴ*
κρίνων ἐν ᾧ (*ἐν τούτῳ δ*) *δοκιμάζει*, 1 Thess. v. 12 *κοπιῶντες ἐν ὑμῖν*
 who labor *upon* you, Rom. i. 9 *λατρεύειν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* (1 Thess.
 iii. 2 *συνεργὸς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* var.), 1 Cor. vii. 15; to denote an
 ethical relation, 2 Cor. iv. 2 *περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ* (Eph. ii. 3,
 362 10; v. 2), Rom. vi. 2 *ζῆν ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ* (Fr. in loc.), Col. iii. 7 (Cic.
 362^{th ed.} fam. 9, 26), cf. 1 Cor. vi. 20; 2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Jno. ii. 8; in a
 more extended sense, of the object *in* (*on*, *at*) which one rejoices,
 glories etc., *χαίρειν, καυχᾶσθαι, ἐν* see § 33 p. 232.

b) The measure or standard (Thuc. 1. 77; 8, 89) *in, according*
to, which something is executed, Eph. iv. 16 (Heb. iv. 11), cf. the

Hebrew א. Many understand it so in Heb. x. 10 ἐν ᾧ θελήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν *according*, in conformity, to *which will*. Here, however, ἐν is more precise than κατά: It is founded *in* the will of God, that we are sanctified through Christ's sacrificial death. In no other passage does the meaning *secundum* occur, although even the most recent N. T. Lexicons give copious examples in support of it. 'Εν ἐμοί *according to my judgment*, 1 Cor. xiv. 11, is properly: *to me* (in my conception) cf. Wex, Antig. p. 187. In Rom. i. 24; viii. 15; xi. 25 (var.); Phil. ii. 7 ἐν denotes condition. 1 Thess. iv. 15 may be translated: *this I say unto you in a word of the Lord*, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 7; xiv. 6. In περιπατεῖν ἐν σοφίᾳ 346 and similar phrases, σοφία is not represented as a rule *according* 6th ed. to which, but as an ideal possession, or even a sphere *within* which to walk (see above). To understand ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν κυρίῳ, as meaning *according to the will or example of Christ*, would be to take a flat view of the apostle's conception. Lastly, 1 Tim. i. 18 ὡς στρατεῖν ἐν αὐταῖς (ταῖς προφηταῖς) τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν is probably to be interpreted, conformably to the figure, *in* prophesyings, equipped with them so to speak (as the actual warrior is *in arms*).

c) The (external) occasion, Acts vii. 29 ἔφυγεν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ *at (on) this saying*, Xen. equestr. 9, 11; hence sometimes the ground, cause, Matt. vi. 7 ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθήσονται *on account of* their much speaking (properly *on* their etc.), cf. Aelian. anim. 11, 31; Dio C. 25, 5, and ἐν τούτῳ Jno. xvi. 30 *therefore*,¹ probably also 1 Cor. iv. 4 (cf. Plutarch. glor. Athen. c. 7 ἐν τούτοις); ἐν ᾧ (for ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι) *because* Rom. viii. 3 see Fr. In 406 many languages, however, a concomitant is assigned thus as a *cause*: in Latin, *propter* strictly means *near*; and the German *weil* (because) is properly a particle of time (during). 'Εν in

¹ In Heb. xi. 2 ἐν ταύτῃ (τῇ πίστει) denotes not the ground, but the (ideal) possession: *in hac (constituti)*, cf. 1 Tim. v. 10 (Jno. viii. 21). In Heb. ii. 18 ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν is undoubtedly to be resolved by ἐν τούτῳ ὅ in *eo quod*, see above p. 159. This same meaning occurs in 1 Pet. ii. 12. In Heb. vi. 17 ἐν ᾧ may be referred to ὅρκος preceding, though (as sometimes ἐφ' ᾧ) the rendering *quapropter*, *quare*, would not be inappropriate. In Rom. ii. 1 ἐν ᾧ may be rendered *dum*, or better, with the Vulgate, *in quo* (in qua re) *judicas* etc., which gives a sense quite in point, cf. Fr. In Luke x. 20 ἐν τούτῳ . . . ὅτι means, *at this (rejoice) that*, cf. Phil. i. 18. I am not aware of there being in any Greek author an unquestionable instance of ἐν τούτῳ, ἐν ᾧ, in the sense of *therefore*, *because*. The passages adduced in Sturz, Lexic. Xenoph. II. 162, admit of another meaning. Xen. A. 1, 3, 1 — a passage which Kypke, II. 194, refers to this head — has in the best editions ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Likewise Plat. rep. 5, 455 b., where Ast explains ἐν ᾧ by *propterea quod*, is susceptible of another exposition; see Stallb. in loc.

363 the sense of *propter* is never joined to names of persons (see my 7th ed. Comment. ad Gal. i. 24, cf. Exod. xiv. 4);¹ and in general too many passages have been referred to this head, as Eph. iii. 13; Jno. viii. 21; Jas. i. 25; 2 Cor. vi. 12; Heb. iv. 11.

d) The instrument and means (principally in the Rev.), not merely (as in the better Greek prose authors, see Bttm. Philoct. p. 69; Boeckh, Pind. III. 487; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 195, and the uncritical collections in Schwarz, Comment. p. 476; Georgi, Vind. 153 sq.) where the German *in* also (or *auf*) is admissible, as *καίειν* 347 *ἐν πυρί* Rev. xvii. 16 (1 Cor. iii. 13), cf. 1 Macc. v. 44; vi. 31 7th ed. (*δῆσαι ἐν πέδαις* Xen. A. 4, 8, 8; cf. Judg. xv. 13; xvi. 7; Sir. xxviii. 19; Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 104, *καλύπτειν ἐν ἱματίῳ* Ael. anim. 11, 15), *μετρεῖν ἐν μέτρῳ* Matt. vii. 2, *ἀλίζειν ἐν ἄλατι* Matt. v. 13; Rev. vii. 14; Jas. iii. 9; Heb. ix. 22, but also, through the influence of the Hebrew *ב*, in circumstances quite different from this, where in Greek authors the Dative would be employed alone as the casus instrumentalis, as Luke xxii. 49 *πατάσσειν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ*, Rev. vi. 8 *ἀποκτείνειν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ*, xiii. 10; xiv. 15 *κράζειν ἐν μεγάλῃ φωνῇ* (2 Pet. ii. 16), Matt. vii. 6 *καταπατεῖν ἐν τοῖς ποσίν*, Luke i. 51; Mark 407 xiv. 1; Rom. xv. 6, especially in the Rev. (cf. Judg. iv. 16; xv. 15; xx. 16, 48; 1 Kings xii. 18; Josh. x. 35; Exod. xiv. 21; xvi. 3; xvii. 5, 13; xix. 13; Gen. xxxii. 20; xli. 36; xlviii. 22; Neh. i. 10; 1 Macc. iv. 15; Judith ii. 19; v. 9; vi. 4, 12, etc.).² Yet such constructions occasionally occur even in Greek authors; as, Himer. eclog. 4, 16 *ἐν ξίφει*, Hippocr. aphor. 2, 36 *ἐν φαρμακείῃσι καθά- 364 ρεσθαι*, Malal. 2 p. 50.³ *Ἐν* is so used with personal designations,

¹ In 2 Cor. xiii. 4 *ἀσθενούμεν ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ*, as frequently *ἐν Χριστῷ* (so variously understood by expositors), denotes fellowship with Christ, the relation of *εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ* (see below, p. 389). The apostle is not weak *for Christ's sake* (out of regard as it were for the interest of Christ, to prevent the possible falling away of the Corinthians); but weak *in Christ*, i.e. *in* and conformably to (apostolic) fellowship with Christ (who likewise was in a certain sense *ἀσθενής*; see what precedes). The phrase designates concisely a state which results from *being in Christ*; just as the *ζῆν* and *δυνατὸν εἶναι* are referred to fellowship with Christ (*σύν*). Just as little does Eph. iv. 1 *ἡ δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ* mean *the prisoner for Christ's sake*. Somewhat more remote is Phil. i. 8 *ἐπιποθῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐν σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ* 'I, see Bengel.

² It would be a mistake to suppose that in Eph. ii. 15 (§ 31, note 1, p. 220) and vi. 4 *ἐν* denotes the instrument. In the latter passage *παιδεία καὶ νοουθεσία κυρίου* is the sphere *in* which the children are trained, cf. Polyb. 1, 65, 7. Even in the expression *ἀλλάσσειν τι ἐν τῷ* Rom. i. 23, I cannot with Fr. adopt the meaning *per*, nor do I think that the Hebrew *ב* with *בְּחָיִל* is to be so understood. *To change something in gold* is either an abbreviated expression, or gold is conceived as that *in* which the exchange is effected. The *ἐν* of price is similar; see above and p. 390.

³ Many passages that might be adduced under this head from Greek authors, are to

Matt. ix. 34 ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια, Acts xvii. 31 κρίνειν ἐν ἀνδρὶ *in* a man, cf. Thuc. 7, 8, 2; Mtth. II. 1341, not Jno. xvii. 10; 2 Thess. i. 10, or by any means Acts xvii. 28.¹ The phrase ὁμόσαι ἐν τινι Matt. v. 34 ff. does not signify *jurare per* 348 (see Fr. in loc.), but more simply: swear *by* (on) something. So 408 likewise in other passages ἐν does not properly signify *through*: 1 Cor. vii. 14 ἡγίασται ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί means, he is sanctified *in* the wife, — the foundation rather than the means of sanctification being indicated. In Rom. xv. 16 ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ and not διὰ πν. ἀγ. is employed designedly, *in* the Holy Spirit (an internal principle). Related to this is 1 Cor. xv. 22 ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσι, Acts iv. 2 ἐν Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν καταγγέλλειν. Least of all does ἐν Χριστῷ (κυρίῳ) ever signify *per* Chr. (Fr. Rom. I. 397, the precise expression for which is διὰ Ἰησ. Χρ.), Rom. vi. 11 ζῶντες τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. (the Christian lives not merely through Christ, beneficio Christi, but *in* Christ, in soul-nourishing fellowship with Christ), vi. 23; 2 Cor. ii. 14; but this phrase invariably refers, for the most part in an abbre-

be otherwise explained, as ὁρᾶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Lucian. Phalar. 1, 5, ἐν ὁμμασιν ὑποβλέπειν Lucian. amor. 29 (cf. *Wer*, Antig. I. 270), Porphy. de antro Nymphar. p. 261 ἀμφοτέρων, ἐν οἷς . . . ἀρνούμεθα, Lucian. asin. 44 ὡς τεθηγκῶς ἐν ταῖς πληγαῖς (*under* the blows), Plat. Tim. 81 c. τετραμμένης ἐν γάλακτι brought up *on* milk (cf. *Jacobs*, Athen. p. 57). In Lucian. conscr. hist. 12 for ἐν ἀκορτίῳ φονεύειν recent editors on the authority of MSS. give ἐν ἀκ. φ.; on the other hand, in Lucian. dial. mort. 23, 3 all the Codd. but *one* have καθιζόμενον ἐν τῇ βέβδῳ (not so Ael. 2, 6), yet *Lehmann* considers the preposition σθεν in this passage as suspicious (cf. Lucian. Lapith. c. 26). See, besides, *Engelhardt*, Plat. Menex. p. 261; *Dissen*, Pind. p. 487.

¹ In Jno. xvii. 10 δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς undoubtedly signifies more than δι' αὐτῶν. He would have been glorified *through* them, if they had merely accomplished some external achievement conducive to the glory of Christ; he is glorified *in* them, in so far as they in their own persons, *in themselves*, glorify Christ. In the same way to live and have one's being *in God*, appears to express man's subsistence, his being rooted as it were, in the divine power, with greater precision than could be done by διὰ. When ἐν and διὰ are joined together in one and the same sentence, διὰ expresses thus the external means, while ἐν points to what was wrought in or on one's person, and as it were cleaves to him, Eph. i. 7 ἐν ᾧ (Χριστῷ) ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ (where *Mey.* is wrong), iii. 6. Even when things, and not persons, are in question, the distinction between ἐν (referring to mental states or powers) and διὰ (of the means) is perceptible; as, 1 Pet. i. 5 τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ θρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως, see *Steiger* in loc., i. 22 ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ πνεύματος, Heb. x. 10. Lastly, passages in which ἐν and διὰ in reference to things are interchanged in the same proposition, Col. i. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 19, merely show that both prepositions are identical as respects the *sense*. Even ἐν in Matt. iv. 4 ἐν παντὶ ῥήματι does not appear to be exactly equivalent to ἐπὶ in ἐπ' ἑσπ. μόνῳ; but the latter (ἐπὶ) denotes the basis, ἐν the (spiritual) element, of life. At all events, *through* or *by means of* would be an inaccurate translation.

viated way, to the *being in Christ* εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Thess. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 1; xvi. 11; 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. i. 22), and Luther's "barbarous" translation (Fr. II. 85)¹ is to be retained. So likewise in 1 Cor. xii. 3 ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλῶν is to be rendered quite
 365 literally, *speaking in the Spirit of God*, the element in which the
 7th ed. speaker lives (Rom. ix. 1; xiv. 17; Col. i. 8).

e) The price, after the analogy of the Hebrew, Rev. v. 9 ἀγοράζειν ἐν τῷ αἵματι (1 Chron. xxi. 24). The value of the thing purchased is contained *in* the price (to which the ἐκ of the price then corresponds).

Even in the most recent Lexicons the significations of this preposition have been unwarrantably multiplied or its real significations incorrectly applied to passages of the N. T. The interpretations which have been given to the phrase ἐν ὀνόματι τινος in particular are Protean. The ἐν here causes no difficulty, for it simply means *in*. And something takes place 'in a person's name' when it is comprehended or embraced in his name, is to be set down to his personal activity, cf. Acts iv. 7 (not to his who is the nearest, the immediate, subject, cf. Jno. v. 43). Only the various verbs which are limited by ἐν ὀνόματι require the expositor's attention, in order that the various senses may be traced back severally in the simplest manner to the literal meaning of the phrase. This task has not yet been performed satisfactorily (yet better by Harless, Eph. S. 484, than by van Hengel, Philip. p. 161 sq.), not even by Mey. Phil. ii. 10 seems to require separate treatment: ὄνομα here refers to ὄνομα in vs. 9, and ἐν ὀνόματι denotes the name upon which those that bow the knee unite, on which united all (πάν γόνυ) worship. The name which Jesus has received moves all to united adoration. In Tit. iii. 5 ἐν does not indicate the *finis* or *consilium*; but ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ mean, works performed in the
 409 spirit of a δίκαιος; as to Luke i. 17; 1 Cor. vii. 15 see below. In Mark ix. 50 ἐληγμένετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις, the rendering *erga* is not necessary; we, too,

¹ In so far as the Christian abides (by faith) in living (inward, hence ἐν) fellowship with Christ, he will do everything in the consciousness of this fellowship, and through the strength which this fellowship confers, i.e. *in Christ, in the Lord; as a Christian, in a Christian spirit*, etc., as the words are frequently rendered, expresses much less than the pregnant phrase *in Christ*. So in Rom. xvi. 12 *who labor in the Lord*, conscious of their fellowship with the Lord (unworldly κοινῶν is meant), 1 Cor. xv. 18 *who fell asleep in Christ*, in conscious, steadfast fellowship with Christ (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16; Rev. xiv. 13), Rom. ix. 1 (a passage which even Bengel misunderstood) *speaking the truth in Christ* (as one living in Christ), xiv. 14 *persuaded in the Lord* (of a truth of which one in living union with Christ is assured). As to 1 Cor. iv. 15 see Mey. In the same way εὐπλοεσθαι ἐν Χρ. Phil. iii. 9 is to be explained. See besides, Rom. xv. 17; xvi. 2, 22; 1 Cor. vii. 39; Phil. iv. 1 (Eph. vi. 1), 1 Pet. v. 10. Fr. Rom. II. 82 sqq. is essentially right, though his remarks are not free from misapprehensions nor from unnecessary matter. See, besides, v. Hengel, Cor. p. 81.

say: *among* (one another) *yourselves*. The following interpretations appear still more inadmissible:

a. *ex*,¹ Heb. xiii. 9 ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες *unde* (Schott) nihil commodi perceperunt (cf. ὠφελείσθαι ἀπό Aeschin. dial. 2, 11). If ἐν 349 οἷς is to be joined to ὠφελήθ., the preposition indicates the profit that would th *ad* have originated *therein* or attached *thereto*, Xen. Athen. rep. 1, 3; Demosth. Pantaen. 631 a.; but ἐν οἷς belongs to περιπατήσαντες. Matt. i. 20 τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν means, that which has been begotten *in her* (*in ejus utero*).

b. *pro, loco*, Rom. xi. 17 (Schott) ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς (κλάδοις) means: 366 *grafted on the branches* (of which some had been cut off). th *ad*

c. *with*. In Acts xx. 32 ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις signifies, *among* (with) *the sanctified*. Acts vii. 14 μετεκαλέσατο τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ . . . ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομ. means, (consisting) *in* seventy souls; αἰ is used in the same way in Deut. x. 22; I do not, however, know of an instance in a Greek author. Fr.'s explanation of these words (ad Mr. p. 604) appears to me too far-fetched, and it has been rejected by Wahl also. In Eph. vi. 2 ἡρῆς ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ undoubtedly means not merely, *annexa, addita promissione*, but *the first in promise*, i.e. in point of promise (not ἐν τάξει Chrysost.). So also Mey.

d. *by* (*of*). In Eph. iv. 21 εἶγε ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε *if ye were taught in him* is closely connected with ἀποθίσθαι etc. following, and consequently means, conformably to fellowship with Christ, as believers in Christ.

As to ἐν for εἰς, see § 50, no. 4, p. 413 sq.

b. Σύν *with* as distinguished from μετά indicates a more intimate union;² as, among persons, partnership in calling, faith, fortune, etc. Acts ii. 14; xiv. 4, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 32. Hence it is generally used in reference to spiritual fellowship, as that of believers with Christ, Rom. vi. 8; Col. ii. 13, 20; iii. 3; 1 Thess. iv. 17; v. 10; or that of believers with Abraham, Gal. iii. 9 (σύν denoting in all these cases not mere resemblance, but actual association). Then in reference to things it denotes powers combining and co-operating *with* a person, 1 Cor. v. 4; xv. 10. It would be extended to a less intimate connection in 2 Cor. viii. 19 *with* the collection; yet here ἐν seems the preferable reading. On 410 the other hand, cf. Luke xxiv. 21 σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον *along with all this*, i.e. *joined to all this is the additional fact that* etc. (Neh. v. 18; cf. Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 5).

¹ Fischer, Weller. p. 141, adopts this meaning even for πίνειν ἐν ἀργύρῳ, χρυσῷ etc. (Isocr. paneg. c. 30; Diog. L. 1, 104, bibere in ossibus Flor. 3, 4, 2). With equal reason might it be asserted that in German *auf* is the same as *von* because we say *auf* silbernen Tellern essen, which, according to the analogy of 'aus silbernen Bechern trinken,' is equivalent to 'von silbernen Tellern.'

² Krü. 287 "σύν τιμι denotes rather *coherence*; μετά τιμος, rather *co-existence*."

c. *Ἐπί*. The primary, local, import is *upon*, *above*, (applied both to heights and plains):¹ Matt. xiv. 11 *ἡνέχθη ἡ κεφαλὴ ἐπὶ πῖνακι*, Mark i. 45 *ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις* (see above, *ἐπί* with Gen.; cf. *ἀνάγειν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον* Matt. iv. 1), vi. 39; Luke xxi. 6; Rev. xix. 14, also Jno. iv. 6 *ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ οὐ* (at) the well (the rim of the well rises above the well itself), Rev. ix. 14 (Xen. An. 1, 2, 8; 5, 3, 2; Cyr. 7, 5, 11; Isocr. paneg. c. 40; Dio C. 177, 30; see ^{6th ed.} above, § 47 g.).² Sometimes it signifies *at* (*on*) Jno. v. 2 *ἐπὶ τῇ* 367 *προβατικῇ* at the sheep-gate, Acts iii. 10, 11; Matt. xxiv. 33 *ἐπὶ* 7th ed. *θύραις* (Xen. C. 8, 1, 33, yet see note ³ p. 374); it is applied also in this sense to persons, Acts v. 35 *πράσσειν τι ἐπὶ τινι* inflict something on one (do something to), cf. *δρᾶν τι ἐπὶ τινι* Her. 3, 14; Ael. anim. 11, 11. Lastly, it signifies (*contiguity*) *at*, *with* either in reference to place (*apud*) Acts xxviii. 14 *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιμεῖναι*, or to time Heb. ix. 26 *ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εὐθὺς finem mundi*: and so Phil. i. 3 *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνηί ὑμῶν οὐ* every remembrance of you, Mark vi. 52 *οὐ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις*, 2 Cor. ix. 6 *σπεῖρειν, θερίζειν ἐπ' εὐλογίαις* with blessings, so that blessings attend; and in another application in Heb. ix. 15 *τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων* with (under) the first covenant (during the existence of the first covenant). In this sense it is applied also to persons, Heb. x. 28 (Sept.) *ἐπὶ τρισὶ μάρτυσι* with (before) three witnesses, *adhibitis testibus*. It likewise indicates what is closely connected (in time), what follows on some event, Xen. C. 2, 3, 7 *ἀνέστη ἐπ' αὐτῷ Φεραύλας* directly after (Appian. civ. 5, 3; Paus. 7, 25, 6; Dio C. 325, 89, and 519, 99; cf. Wurm, Dinarch. p. 39 sq.; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 30). Some explain in this way Acts xi. 19 *ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ* (see Alberti in loc.); but *ἐπὶ* there means rather *upon* (on account of) or *against* (Matthäi in loc.), cf. Schaef. Plutarch. V. 17; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 288.

- 411 *Figuratively ἐπί* denotes, in general, the foundation on which an action or state rests, Phil. iii. 9; so in Matt. iv. 4 *ζῆν ἐπ' ἄρτῳ* Sept. (corresponding to *ἐν ῥήματι*) after the Hebrew *בַּרְמָה* Deut.

¹ According to Krü. 308 *ἐπί* with Gen. indicates rather an accidental and more loose connection; *ἐπί* with Dat., the notion of belonging to.

² The signification *upon* is perceptible also in Luke xii. 53 *ἔσονται . . . πατὴρ ἐφ' οὐ* καὶ υἱὸς *ἐπὶ πατρί* the father will be upon him, that is, as a load, oppressing, agreeably to the vulgar idiom; cf. the German, Vater und Sohn liegen sich auf dem Halse. *Against*, however, here expresses the meaning correctly. I cannot, however, decide with Wahl to apply the same meaning to Luke xxiii. 38. Rom. x. 19 is of quite a different sort.

viii. 3 (though it is thus used also in Greek authors, Plato Alcib. 1, 105 c.; Alciph. 3, 7; cf. *sustentare vitam*). Here belongs also ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί τινος (Lucian. pisc. 15; cf. Schoem. Isae. p. 463 sq.) to do something *upon* the name of some one, i.e. in doing it to rely upon, or have reference to, the name of some one. The expression has various applications in the N. T.: ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησ. Χρ. *to teach upon* (in) *the name of Christ* (Luke xxiv. 47; Acts iv. 17; v. 28, 40), i.e. by referring to him as the source of doctrine and authority; *to cast out demons upon* (in) *the name of Christ*, Luke ix. 49, i.e. making the efficacy of the exorcising depend on his name (uttered on the occasion as a solemn form); *baptism upon* (in) *the name of Christ* is baptism founded on the acknowledgment of his name, Acts ii. 38; *to receive any one upon* (in) *the name of Christ*, Matt. xviii. 5, i.e. because he bears his name, confesses him, etc.

Special senses of ἐπὶ are

a) *Over*, of superintendence, Luke xii. 44 ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι καταστήσει αὐτόν, cf. Xen. C. 6, 3, 28 (as elsewhere with Gen. Lob. Phryn. p. 474 sq.).

b) *Over*, *to*, of addition to something already existing, Luke iii. 20 προσέθηκε καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσι, Matt. xxv. 20 ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς in addition to those five talents (if ἐπ' αὐτοῖς is genuine), Luke xvi. 26 ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις *besides, over and above, all this*, Lucian. conser. hist. 31; Aristoph. plut. 628 (cf. Wetsten. and Kypke in loc.). Phil. ii. 17; Col. iii. 14; Eph. vi. 16 (cf. Polyb. 6, 23, 12). Hence in Jno. iv. 27 ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ *upon this*, as Jesus spoke thus with etc., came the disciples. It is used somewhat differently in 2 Cor. vii. 13 ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει περισσotέρως μᾶλλον ἐχάρημεν *besides my consolation, I rejoiced*, etc.

c) *Over*, of the object after verbs denoting an emotion, as θαυμάζειν, ὑγαλλῶν, πενθεῖν, λυπείσθαι, ὀργίζεσθαι, [μακροθυμεῖν], μετανοεῖν, Luke i. 47; xviii. 7; Mark iii. 5; xii. 17; Matt. vii. 28; Rom. x. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Rev. xii. 17; xviii. 11 (Plat. symp. 217 a. and 206 b.; Isocr. paneg. 22; Lucian. philops. 14; Aristot. rhet. 2, 10, 1; Palaeoph. 1, 8; Joseph. antt. 5, 1, 26 a.). With εὐχαριστεῖν it signifies to give thanks *over* (for), 1 Cor. i. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 15; Phil. i. 3 sq.; Polyb. 18, 26, 4. It is also employed with verbs of speaking, Rev. x. 11 προφητεῦσαι ἐπὶ λαοῖς (xxii. 16 var.), Jno. xii. 16 ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα (Her. 1, 66; Paus. 3, 13, 3; 412 cf. Schoemann, Plut. Agis p. 71).

d) *On*, of a supposition or condition (Xen. symp. 1, 5; Diod. S. 2, 24; Lucian. conscr. hist. 38; Aesop. 21, 1): *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι* *on* (in) hope, 1 Cor. ix. 10 (Plat. Alcib. 1, 105 b., *ἐπ' ἐλπίσι* Dio Chr. 1003, 21; Herod. 3, 12, 20), Heb. ix. 17 *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς* (*on* one's death) after men are dead, when death has taken place.¹ It is used also of motive, Luke v. 5 *ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί σου χαλάσω τὸ δίκτυον* *on* thy word, induced by thy word, Acts iii. 16 *ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει* *on* account of the faith, xxvi. 6; Matt. xix. 9 (1 Cor. viii. 11 var.);² cf. Xen. Mem. 3, 14, 2; Cyr. 1, 3, 16; 1, 4, 24; 4, 5, 14; Her. 1, 137; Lucian. Hermot. 80; Isocr. areop. 336; Dio Chr. 29, 293. Hence *ἐφ' ᾧ* *wherefore, on which account*, Diod. S. 19, 98 (*ἐφ' ᾧπερ* Dio C. 43, 95, etc.), and *because* 2 Cor. v. 4; Rom. v. 12; probably also Phil. iii. 12 (*on this account that, for ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι* see Fr. Rom. I. 299 sq.), *eo quod*.³

e) *To, for*, of aim and issue, 1 Thess. iv. 7 *οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ* *to uncleanness*, Gal. v. 13 (like *καλεῖν ἐπὶ ξενίᾳ* Xen. An. 7, 6, 3, and the like; see Sintenis, Plutarch. Them. p. 147), 2 Tim. ii. 14; Eph. ii. 10, cf. Xen. An. 5, 7, 34; Mem. 2, 3, 19; Plat. rep. 8, 389 b.; Diod. S. 2, 24; Arrian. Alex. 1, 26, 4; 2, 18, 9; Diog. L. 1, 7, 2; cf. Index to Dio C. ed. Sturz p. 148 sq., according to some *ἐφ' ᾧ* Phil. iii. 12 *unto which* (for which).

f) *After*, of the rule, model, Luke i. 59 *καλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι* *after the name* (Neh. vii. 63). To this head, probably, belongs 352 also Rom. v. 14 *ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ* *ad* (Vulg. 6th ed. *in*) *similitudinem* peccati Ad.; for other explanations, see Meyer. 369 2 Cor. ix. 6, however, we cannot with Philippi (Röm.-Br. S. 172) 7th ed. understand in the same way; see above, p. 392.

When *ἐπί* with Dat. in a local sense is joined to a verb of direction or motion (Matt. ix. 16; Jno. viii. 7, not Matt. xvi. 18; Acts iii. 11), the phrase 413 includes together with the idea of motion that of tarrying and resting also.

d. *Παρά* *beside* i.e. properly *near, at the side of*, used of place, with the Dative of the thing only in Jno. xix. 25 (Soph. Oed. C.

¹ Yet several of these passages may be referred to the more general signification *ad*, *with* (see above), as is done by Fr. Rom. I. 315.

² Ἀπολείται δ' ἀσθενῶν ἀδελφὸς ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ γνώσει (where, however, good authorities [Sin also] read ἐν) is, properly, *perishes on thy knowledge* i.e. because thy knowledge is urged, — briefly, *through* thy knowledge. But *ἐπὶ* does not therefore, as *Grotius* Rom. v. 12 maintains, strictly mean *through*.

³ The Greeks usually employ the Plural, *ἐφ' οἷς* (but *ἐπὶ τῷδε* Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 211). *Rothe* (Versuch über Röm. v. 12 ff. p. 17 ff.) has recently asserted that in the N. T. this *ἐφ' ᾧ* should be uniformly rendered on the supposition, on the understanding, on condition, that, in as far as. There is no passage, however, in which this would not be artificial and forced; cf. Rückert, Comment. zu Röm. 2 Aufl. I. 262.

1160; Plato Ion 535 b.), elsewhere with the Dat. of the person (Krü. 299); sometimes denoting

a) What is externally *near, by, with*, Luke ix. 47, or what is in one's vicinity, province, custody, 2 Tim. iv. 13 *φελόνην ἀπέλιπον παρὰ Κάρπῳ*, 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (Aristot. pol. 1, 7), Luke xix. 7 (where *παρὰ ἁμαρτ.* belongs to *καταλύσαι*), Col. iv. 16; Rev. ii. 13; Acts x. 6; xviii. 3. Sometimes, and more frequently,

b) In reference to what is *ideally near* one, in one's possession, power, capacity, etc. (*penes*); as, *Matt. xix. 26 *παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν, παρὰ δὲ θεῷ πάντα δυνατά*, Rom. ii. 11 οὐ γάρ ἐστι προσωποληψία παρὰ θεῷ, ix. 14; Luke i. 37 (*παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ* is a clerical mistake) cf. Demosth. cor. 352 a. *εἰ ἐστι παρ' ἐμοί τις ἐμπειρία*, Jas. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 17, especially of the judgment, Acts xxvi. 8 *τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῶν* etc. (apud vos), Rom. xii. 16 *μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς* (Prov. iii. 7) before yourselves (as judges), in your own estimation, in your own eyes, 1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 8 (Her. 1, 32; Plato Theact. 170 d.; Soph. Trach. 586; Eurip. Bacch. 399, and Electr. 737; Bhdy. 257). So likewise 2 Pet. ii. 11 *οὐ φέρουσι κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίῳ* (before the Lord as Judge) *βλάσφημον κρίσω* were the words *π. κυρ.* genuine, and, substantially, 1 Cor. vii. 24 *ἕκαστος ἐν ᾧ ἐκλήθη, ἐν τούτῳ μετέω παρὰ θεῷ with, before God*, on the plane of God's judgment. That *παρά* with the Dat. denotes strictly direction *towards*,¹ cannot be established (Wahl in his Clav.) by Luke ix. 47, still less by Luke xix. 7 (see a) above).

e. *Πρός* has the same primary import as *παρά*, but is used in the N. T. only in its local sense: *at, by, in the* (immediate) *vicinity of*; as, Jno. xviii. 16 *πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ*, xx. 11, 12; Mark v. 11 (to 414 adduce instances of the same use of *πρός* from Greek authors would be superfluous; for the assertion of Münster, Symbol. ad intptat. ev. Joa. p. 31, is untrue). So likewise Rev. i. 13 *περιεζωσμένος πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην* girded about *at* the breasts with a girdle (Xen. C. 7, 1, 33). In Luke xix. 37 *ἐγγίζοντος ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν* is to be rendered: as he was 370 already close *to* etc. (In the Sept. *πρός* with the Dative occurs 7th ed. much more frequently than in the N. T.)

f. *Περί* and *ὑπό* are never used in the N. T. with the Dative.

¹ If *παρά* with the Dat. is employed with a verb of motion, the same attraction must be acknowledged which occurs when *ἐν* is so used. But in Xen. A. 2, 5, 27, which Kühner adduces as the only instance, recent editors on the authority of Codd. give *παρὰ Τισσαφέρνην*. On the other hand, see Plutarch. Themist. c. 5 and Sinenis in loc. It cannot, however, be denied that in the Dative itself the notion of *whither* is originally contained (p. 214). Cf. Hartung über d. Casus. S. 81.

353

6th ed.

§ 49. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE ACCUSATIVE

a. *Εἰς* (the opposite of *ἐκ* Rom. i. 17 ; v. 16).

a) In the *local* sense it denotes not merely *into*, *in among* (Luke x. 36 ; Acts iv. 17, likewise Mark xiii. 14 *εἰς τὰ ὄρη* as we say, *into the mountains*), or (of countries and cities) *to* (into) Matt. xxviii. 16 ; Acts x. 5 ; xii. 19, etc., but also (of levels) *on* Mark xi. 8 *ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν*, Acts xxvi. 14 ; Rev. ix. 3, and even simply *to* (ad), *thitherward* (of motion or direction) Mark iii. 7 (Polyb. 2, 23, 1), Matt. xxi. 1 ; Jno. xi. 38 *ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον* cometh *to* the tomb, cf. vs. 41 ; iv. 5 cf. vs. 28 ; xx. 1 cf. vs. 11 ; Acts ix. 2 ; Luke vi. 20 *ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς* towards his disciples, Rev. x. 5 (*εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*) Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 11 ; Aeschin. dial. 2, 2. In reference to persons it hardly signifies *to* (*πρός* or *ὡς* Mdv. 33 ; Bhdy. 215), but *among*, *inter*, Acts xx. 29 ; xxii. 21 ; Luke xi. 49 ; Rom. v. 12 ; xvi. 26 ; Plato Prot. 349 a. ; Gorg. 526 b. (when it occasionally approaches the import of the Dative, Luke xxiv. 47, see above, § 31, 5) ;¹ in one passage, into a person's *house*, Acts xvi. 40 *εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν Αὐδίαν* (according to many [minuscule] Codd.) see Valcken. in loc. cf. Lys. orat. 2 in. Strabo 17, 796 ; Fischer, Well. III. II. p. 150 ; Schoem. Isae. 363, and Plutarch. Agis p. 124, (but the better Codd. [Sin. also] give *πρός*).

415 b) Applied to *time*, *εἰς* signifies sometimes a point, limit *for*, at which Acts iv. 3 (Herod. 3, 5, 2), or *up to*, *till* which, Jno. xiii. 1 ; 2 Tim. i. 12 ;² sometimes a period (*for*, *during*, like *ἐπί*) Luke xii. 19 *εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη* (Xen. M. 3, 6, 13).

c) Used tropically, of *ideal* relations, it denotes any *aim* or *end* ; as, Acts xxviii. 6 *μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον* unto, towards (on) him, cf. Plut. Moral. p. 786 c. ; hence, α. the *measure*, amount (Bhdy. 218) which something reaches, 2 Cor. x. 13 *εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα κανχᾶσθαι*, iv. 17 (Lucian. dial. mort. 27, 7), cf. also the well-known *εἰς μάλιστα* and *εἰς τῆς*. β. the *condition* into which something is brought, Acts ii. 20 ; Rev. xi. 6 ; Heb. vi. 6 ; cf. like-
371 wise Eph. ii. 21 f. γ. the *result*, Rom. x. 10 (xiii. 14), 1 Cor.
7th ed. xi. 17 *εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον συνέρχεσθε*. δ. the *direction of the feelings*

¹ Likewise in 1 Cor. xiv. 36 ; 2 Cor. x. 14 *εἰς* is more appropriate than *πρός*, inasmuch as in all these passages ideal reaching to one (his knowledge or intercourse with him) is spoken of.

² (The more expressive) *ἕως* (or *μέχρι*) is oftener used in this sense ; and many passages adduced in Lexicons under the signification *usque ad* are not purely temporal, but include the *εἰς* of purpose, aim, Gal. iii. 17, 23 ; Eph. iv. 30.

views, etc. and the deportment *towards* (*erga* and *contra*), 1 Pet. iv. 9 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους, Rom. viii. 7 (Her. 6, 65), xii. 16; Matt. xxvi. 10; 3 Jno. 5; Col. iii. 9; 2 Cor. viii. 24; x. 1; Luke xii. 10, to which sense likewise Col. i. 20 ἀποκαταλλάττειν τι εἰς αὐτόν may be referred (cf. διαλλάττειν πρὸς τινα Demosth. ep. 3, 354 p. 114; Thuc. 4, 59 etc.);¹ further, the direction both of the thoughts, Acts ii. 25 Δαυὶδ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν *aiming at* (referring to) him (dicere in aliquem, cf. Kypke in loc.), Eph. i. 10; v. 32; Heb. vii. 14; cf. Acts xxvi. 6,² and of the desires (*after* something) Phil. i. 23 and of the will in general; and then, the occasion Matt. xii. 41 εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωάνη *at* the preaching; the purpose and end in view (Bhdy. 219) Luke v. 4 χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄβυσσον *for* a draught (to catch), 2 Cor. ii. 12 ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *for the gospel* i.e. in order to publish it, Acts ii. 38; vii. 5; Rom. v. 21; vi. 19; viii. 15; ix. 21; xiii. 14; xvi. 19; Heb. x. 24; xii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 12; 2 Cor. ii. 16; vii. 9; Gal. ii. 8; Phil. i. 25 (εἰς ὃ *for which* Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. i. 11; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 8, εἰς τι Matt. xxvi. 8). In this way are explained also the phrases ἐλπίζειν, πιστεύειν εἰς τινα, as well as the passages in which εἰς relating to persons signifies *for*, Rom. x. 12 πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας, Luke xii. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 1 etc. (and thus borders on the Dat. see a) above), and lastly, the looser connections where εἰς is rendered *in reference to, as respects, with regard to* (Bhdy. 416 220; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 484) Acts xxv. 20; 2 Pet. i. 8; Rom. iv. 20; xv. 2 (of things, Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 1; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 16), 2 Cor. xi. 10; Eph. iii. 16; iv. 15; Rom. xvi. 5 (of persons). Sometimes subjective and objective purpose, aim and effect, cannot be separated, Heb. iv. 16; Luke ii. 34; Rom. xiv. 1; Jude 21. The German *zu, for, to*, includes both.³ Further, cf. § 29, 3 note.

The following alleged significations of εἰς are to be rejected: *Sub* (Rom. xi. 32 cf. Gal. iii. 22); εἰς here retains the signification of *in*, as we can say included *in* just as well as *under*; *With* (of the instrument), in Acts xix. 3 εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα (ἰβαπτίσθημεν) is a direct answer to the question εἰς τί οὖν ἰβαπτίσθητε; strictly the answer should have been, *unto that unto which John baptized*. The expression is abbreviated there-

¹ It is not necessary to consider this phrase pregnant, as Fr. Rom. I. 278 does. It is obviously founded on the same conception as the expression preferred by Greek authors διαλλάττειν πρὸς τινα.

² Likewise ἁμῶν εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα Matt. v. 35 is substantially to be referred to this signification; see Fr. in loc.

³ But in Jno. iv. 14 ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον is probably to be rendered *into*, though BCrusius is of a different opinion.

fore, or rather, inexact. Nor can *εἰς* be strictly rendered *before*, *coram* in Acts xxii. 30 (see Kühnöl), cf. Heind. Plat. Protag. 471; Stallb. Plat. 372 symp. p. 43 sq.; but *ἔστησαν* (αὐτὸν) *εἰς* αὐτούς is: introduced (placed) th *him among them*, in the midst (*εἰς μέσον*). In 2 Cor. xi. 6 *ἐν παντὶ φανερωθέντες εἰς ὑμᾶς* is very nearly: *towards* you (*erga*), as elsewhere *πρὸς* is used. That *εἰς* is ever equivalent to *διὰ* with Gen. is a fiction; and *εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων* Acts vii. 53 is most simply rendered *upon the injunctions of angels* (which, indeed, as respects sense amounts to *in consequence of* such injunctions), unless the interpretation proposed § 32, 4 b. p. 228 be preferred. As to *εἰς* for *ἐν* see § 50, 4, p. 414 sq.

355 b. *Ἀνά upon, up along*¹ (Bhdy. 233 f.), occurs in the N. T. th *chiefly* in the phrase *ἀνὰ μέσον* with Gen. of place, *through the midst of*, (*in*) *between*, Mark vii. 31; Matt. xiii. 25, and figuratively with Gen. of a person, 1 Cor. vi. 5 *διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*. Then, with numerals, in a distributive sense; as, Jno. ii. 6 *ὑδρίαὶ χωροῦσαι ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς* *containing two or three metretae apiece*, [Matt. xx. 9], Luke ix. 3; x. 1; Mark vi. 40 (where Lehm. [and Tdf.] following Codd. B. [Sin.] give *κατὰ*); so frequently in Greek authors. The preposition thus gradually assumes the nature of an adverb (Bhdy. 234). This distributive signification, probably grew out of such phrases as *ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος* every year, year by year.

417 Hug, in the Freiburger Zeitschr. VI. 41 f., proposed to render the above passage from John: containing *about* two or three metretae; but he has not succeeded in establishing such a use.¹ In Polyb. 2, 10, 3 and Dio Cass. 59, 2 *ἀνά* manifestly signifies *each, apiece*. In Polyb. 1, 16, 2 nobody will believe that the writer intended to state the strength of the Roman legion indefinitely, as merely '*about*' 4000 foot and 300 cavalry. In Her. 7, 184 *ἀνὰ διηκισίους ἄνδρας λογιζόμενοι ἐν ἐκάστη νηὶ* is a pleonastic expression, similar to others of frequent occurrence—200 apiece . . . in each ship, (at the rate of etc.). Rev. iv. 8 *ἐν καθ' ἐν αὐτῶν ἔχον ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἕξ* is similar. Moreover, the Greeks use *ἐπὶ* with the Acc. to express *about, for*, a numerical amount.

c. *Διὰ* with the Acc. indicates the *ground* (ratio), not the design (not even in 1 Cor. vii. 2),² and signifies *on account of* (even in

¹ *Hm. de partic. &c.* p. 5: Primum ac proprium usum habet in iis, quae in al. rei superficie ab imo ad summum eundo conspiciuntur: motus enim significationem ei adhaerere quum ex eo intelligitur, quod non est apta visa quae cum verbo *εἶναι* componeretur, tum docet usus ejus adverbialis, ut ἀλλ' ἀνα ἕξ ἑδρώνων. Further, cf. *Spitzner de vi et usu praeposit.* ἀνὰ et κατὰ. Viteb. 1831.

² That is to say, it is only *per consequens* that the notion of design is implied in *διὰ τὰς πορνείας*: *on account of fornications let every man have his own wife*. Fornications are

Jno. vii. 43; x. 19; xv. 3 etc.), or, when the motive of an action is meant, *out of, from*, Matt. xxvii. 18 διὰ φθόνου *out of (from) envy*, Eph. ii. 4 διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην (Diod. S. 19, 54 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἡτυχηκότας ἔλεον, Aristot. rhet. 2, 13; Demosth. Conon. 730 c.). As to Rom. iii. 25, which even Reiche has misunder- 373 stood, see Bengel. In Heb. v. 12 διὰ τὸν χρόνον is, *on account* ^{th ed} *of* the time, considering the time (you have enjoyed Christian instruction; ¹ not, as Schulz renders it, *after* so long a time).

Sometimes διὰ with Acc. denotes apparently the means (ground or motive and means are very closely connected, cf. Demosth. cor. 354 a.; Xen. M. 3, 3, 15; Liv. 8, 53; and in the poets διὰ is sometimes used with the Acc. even in a local sense, see Blhdy. 236): Jno. vi. 57 κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὁ τρώγων με ζήσεται 356 ^{th ed} *δε' ἐμέ*, just as in Long. pastor. 2 p. 62 Schaef. διὰ τὰς νύμφας ^{th ed} *ἔζησε*, Plut. Alex. 668 e. But the passage strictly means, *I live by reason of the Father*, that is, because the Father lives, cf. Plat. conv. 283 e.; Fr. Rom. I. 197, who adduces as parallel Cic. Rosc. Am. 22, 63 ut, *propter quos* hanc suavissimam lucem adspexerit, eos indignissime luce privaret. Passages more or less similar are Demosth. Zenoth. 576 a.; Aristoph. Plut. 470; Aeschin. dial. 1, 2; 418 Dion. H. III. 1579; cf. Wyttenb. Plut. Mor. II. p. 2 Lips.; Sintenis, Plutarch. Themist. 121; Thuc. ed. Poppo III. II. 517. But Heb. v. 14; vi. 7 by no means belong here, nor (as de Wette and Ewald still maintain) Rev. xii. 11 ἐνίκησαν διὰ τὸ αἷμα, cf. vii. 14 and what immediately follows, καὶ οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν etc. As to Rom. viii. 11 (where the reading, indeed, varies) see Fr., and as to Jno. xv. 3 Mey. in loc. In 2 Cor. iv. 5; Heb. ii. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 2 (where Schott still renders it by *per*, which gives a false sense even; Bengel otherwise) Rev. iv. 11, διὰ is quite appropriately translated *for the sake of*. So too in Rom. viii. 20² (where Schott has *per* again). But in Rom. xv. 15 διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι

the ground of this regulation, inasmuch as they are to be prevented. In Greek authors also design sometimes in the same way attaches itself to διὰ; see the annotators on Thuc. 4, 40 and 102.

¹ The phrase is used thus, essentially, in Polyb. 2, 21, 2 and elsewhere, see Bleek on the above passage. Schulz insists in applying the temporal sense of διὰ to Heb. ii. 9 likewise. But διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου means, on account of the suffering of death, and is elucidated from the well-known connection, recognized by the apostolic writers, between the sufferings and the exaltation of Christ.

² Here διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα constitutes an antithesis to οὐχ ἐκούσα, *not voluntarily*, but *by reason of him that subjected*,—by the will and command of God. Probably Paul intentionally avoided saying διὰ τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος, equivalent to ὁ θεὸς ὑπέταξε αὐτήν. Adam's sin was the proper and direct cause of the ματαίωτης.

the preposition must not, in consideration of xii. 3 διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, be understood in this sense; both expressions are proper. 1 Jno. ii. 12 is correctly rendered by Lücke. 2 Pet. ii. 2 needs no comment. In 2 Pet. iii. 12 δι' ἣν may be referred to ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρα, and translated *on account of*; yet if referred to παρουσία, as is done by Bengel, it gives sense. Lastly, in Gal. iv. 13 δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός is probably not to be understood (Schott) of the state, condition (δι' ἀσθενείας), but means: *on account of* weakness, owing to a weakness; see Mey.

d. Κατά. The local (primary) meaning is,

874 *ᾶ* down upon (down along, cf. Aeschin. dial. 3, 19), passing *on, through, over* (Xen. C. 6, 2, 22); as, Luke viii. 39 ἀπῆλθε καθ' ^{the ed.} ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων, xv. 14 λιμὸς κατὰ τὴν χώραν *throughout the country*, all over the country, Acts viii. 1 (2 Macc. iii. 14; Strabo 3, 163); Acts v. 15 ἐκφέρειν κατὰ τὰς πλατείας *through the streets*, along the streets, viii. 36 (Xen. An. 4, 6, 11), Luke ix. 6; xiii. 22; Acts xi. 1; xxvii. 2 (Xen. C. 8, 1, 6, Raphel. in loc.).¹ Uniformly of horizontal extension. So even in Acts xxvi. 3 τὰ
 419 κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἔθη καὶ ζητήματα *the customs etc. extending throughout the Jews* (common among the Jews).²

857 b) *on to, towards*, Phil. iii. 14 (κατὰ σκοπὸν *towards the mark*), ^{the ed.} Acts viii. 26; xvi. 7; Luke x. 32 (Aesop. 88, 4; Xen. C. 8, 5, 17); likewise merely of the direction (geographical position, *versus*), Acts ii. 10 τῆς Διβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην, xxvii. 12 λιμένα βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα (Xen. An. 7, 2, 1). Accordingly, κατὰ πρόσωπόν τινος signifies *to one's face i.e. before one's eyes*, Luke ii. 31; Acts iii. 13; so also κατ' ὀφθαλμούς Gal. iii. 1 (Xen. Hist. 1, 14 like κατ' ὄμμα Eurip. Androm. 1064, κατ' ὀμματα Soph. Ant. 756). Likewise in Rom. viii. 27 κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνειν does not mean (in a local sense) *apud deum*, but, properly, *towards God, before God*.³

¹ Κατὰ in its local signification is not properly synonymous with ἐν (as even Kühnöl on Acts xi. 1 asserts). Κατὰ τὴν πόλιν means, *throughout the city*; καθ' ὁδὸν *along the road*, on the road (as on a line). Even κατ' οἶκον, where the primary meaning recedes farthest from view, is used to express a different conception from ἐν οἴκῳ (as zu Hause, *at home* is different from im Hause, *in the house*). Besides, κατὰ has established itself in many phrases where probably ἐν might have been used.

² Hence comes the meaning *with, among*, as οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιεῖτε Acts xvii. 28, cf. xiii. 1 and other passages; see above, p. 193. Κατὰ with a personal pronoun is employed thus, especially in later authors, as merely a circumlocution for a possessive pronoun; see Hase, Leo Diac. p. 230.

³ Against this explanation, adopted also by Fr. Krehl and others, various objections have recently been raised, particularly by Mey. and Philippi. The most unimportant of all is that then κατ' αὐτόν would be used. The emphasis implied in the substantive

Closely connected with this is the *temporal* use of the preposition, sometimes as in Acts xvi. 25 *κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον towards midnight*, and sometimes as in Matt. xxvii. 15 *καθ' ἑορτήν during the festival*, i. 20 *κατ' ὄναρ during a dream, secundum quietem* (Herod. 2, 7, 6, *κατὰ φῶς by daylight* Xen. C. 3, 3, 25, *κατὰ βίον* Plato, Gorg. 488 a.), Heb. ix. 9 also iii. 8 (Sept.) *κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ in the day etc.*, and *κατὰ τὸ αὐτό at the same time* Acts xiv. 1.

Hence it is employed of both place and time in a distributive sense, first with plural nouns, as *κατὰ φυλάς by tribes*, Matt. xxiv. 7 *κατὰ τόπους*, Acts xxii. 19, *κατὰ δύο in pairs* 1 Cor. xiv. 27 (Plato, ep. 6, 323 c.), Mark vi. 40 var.; afterwards frequently with singular nouns, as in Acts xv. 21 *κατὰ πόλιν from city to city* (Diod. S. 19, 77; Plutarch. Clegm. 25; Dio Chr. 16, 461; Palaeph. 52, 7), *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν yearly* Heb. ix. 25 (Plato, pol. 298 e.; Xen. C. 8, 6, 375 16, *κατὰ μῆνα* Xen. An. 1, 9, 17; Dio C. 750, 74), *καθ' ἡμέραν daily* Acts ii. 46; 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (Hm. Vig. 860).¹

Used *figuratively* *κατά* is the preposition of reference and direction to something: either generally, as in Eph. vi. 21 *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ quae ad me pertinent*, Acts xxv. 14, or in limitation of a general expression (Her. 1, 49; Soph. Trach. 102 and 379) Eph. vi. 5 *οἱ κατὰ σάρκα κύριοι as respects the flesh, so far as concerns the flesh*, Rom. ix. 5 *ἐξ ὧν (Ἰουδαίων) ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* (1 Pet. iv. 14), Acts iii. 22; Rom. vii. 22 also xi. 28 and xvi. 25; or specially

a) the measure, the standard, *according to, in conformity to*, as in Eph. iv. 7; Matt. xxv. 15; Jno. ii. 6; Luke ii. 22 *κατὰ νόμον*, Heb. ix. 19 (Xen. Cyr. 5, 5, 6), Acts xxvi. 5; Rom. xi. 21 *κατὰ φύσιν*, Matt. ix. 29 *κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν according to your faith*, as it deserves, 2 Cor. iv. 13; Rom. ii. 2 *κατὰ ἀλήθειαν*, Matt. ii. 16 *κατὰ χρόνον according to the time*. Hence it denotes similarity, sort (pattern), Heb. viii. 8f. *συντελέσω . . . διαθήκην καινὴν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἐποίησα etc.* (1 Kings xi. 10), Acts xviii. 14. Likewise with names of persons *κατά τινα* usually signifies according to some one's opinion Col. ii. 8 (Eph. ii. 2); 2 Cor. xi. 17, or will Rom. xv. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 8; cf. Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 91, or

is easily felt, and is indicated visibly, too, by the position of *κατὰ θεόν*, though the point of principal moment lies in *ὅτι ἐπ' ἁγίων*. The translation, *according to God*, introduces an entirely unnecessary idea into the passage, since of the Spirit no different intercession can be thought of.

¹ Also *καθ' ἑαυτὸν for one's self* is usually referred to this use (see e.g. Passow), but erroneously, as the phrase is not distributive. *Καθ' ἑαυτὸν*, and the like, properly means in reference to one's self, whereby something is restricted to a single subject; hence *for one's self*, adv. *seorsum*. As to *ἕχων κ. ἑαυτὸν*, see Fr. Rom. III. 212.

- c. *Ἐπί*. The primary, local, import is *upon*, *above*, (applied both to heights and plains):¹ Matt. xiv. 11 ἡνέχθη ἡ κεφαλὴ ἐπὶ πύνακι, Mark i. 45 ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις (see above, *ἐπί* with Gen.; cf. ἀνάγειν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον Matt. iv. 1), vi. 39; Luke xxi. 6; Rev. xix. 14, also Jno. iv. 6 ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ *on* (at) the well (the rim of the well rises above the well itself), Rev. ix. 14 (Xen. An. 1, 2, 8; 5, 3, 2; Cyr. 7, 5, 11; Isocr. paneg. c. 40; Dio C. 177, 30; see ^{6th ed.} above, § 47 g.).² Sometimes it signifies *at* (*on*) Jno. v. 2 ἐπὶ τῇ 367 προβατικῇ *at the sheep-gate*, Acts iii. 10, 11; Matt. xxiv. 33 ἐπὶ 7th ed. θύραις (Xen. C. 8, 1, 33, yet see note ⁸ p. 374); it is applied also in this sense to persons, Acts v. 35 πράσσειν τι ἐπὶ τινι inflict something *on* one (do something *to*), cf. δρᾶν τι ἐπὶ τινι Her. 3, 14; Ael. anim. 11, 11. Lastly, it signifies (*contiguity*) *at*, *with* either in reference to place (*apud*) Acts xxviii. 14 ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιμεῖναι, or to time Heb. ix. 26 ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων *sub finem mundi*; and so Phil. i. 3 εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνηίᾳ ὑμῶν *on every remembrance of you*, Mark vi. 52 οὐ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, 2 Cor. ix. 6 σπεύρειν, θερίζειν ἐπ' εὐλογίαις *with* blessings, so that blessings attend; and in another application in Heb. ix. 15 τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων *with* (under) *the first covenant* (during the existence of the first covenant). In this sense it is applied also to persons, Heb. x. 28 (Sept.) ἐπὶ τρισὶ μάρτυσι *with* (before) *three witnesses*, *adhibitis testibus*. It likewise indicates what is closely connected (in time), what follows *on* some event, Xen. C. 2, 3, 7 ἀέστη ἐπ' αὐτῷ Φεραύλας *directly after* (Appian. civ. 5, 3; Paus. 7, 25, 6; Dio C. 325, 89, and 519, 99; cf. Wurm, Dinarch. p. 39 sq.; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 30). Some explain in this way Acts xi. 19 ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ (see Alberti in loc.); but ἐπὶ there means rather *upon* (on account of) or *against* (Matthäi in loc.), cf. Schaef. Plutarch. V. 17; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 288.
- 411 *Figuratively* ἐπὶ denotes, in general, the foundation *on* which an action or state rests, Phil. iii. 9; so in Matt. iv. 4 ζῆν ἐπ' ἄρτῳ Sept. (corresponding to ἐν ῥήματι) after the Hebrew בָּזֶה דֶּבַר Deut.

¹ According to Krü. 308 ἐπὶ with Gen. indicates rather an accidental and more loose connection; ἐπὶ with Dat., the notion of belonging to.

² The signification *upon* is perceptible also in Luke xii. 53 ἔσονται . . . πατὴρ ἐφ' υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί the father will be *upon* him, that is, as a load, oppressing, agreeably to the vulgar idiom; cf. the German, Vater und Sohn liegen sich auf dem Halse. *Against*, however, here expresses the meaning correctly. I cannot, however, decide with Wahl to apply the same meaning to Luke xxiii. 38. Rom. x. 19 is of quite a different sort.

viii. 8 (though it is thus used also in Greek authors, Plato Alcib. 1, 105 c. ; Alciph. 3, 7 ; cf. *sustentare vitam*). Here belongs also ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τινος (Lucian. pisc. 15 ; cf. Schoem. Isae. p. 463 sq.) to do something *upon* the name of some one, i.e. in doing it to rely upon, or have reference to, the name of some one. The expression has various applications in the N. T. : ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησ. Χρ. to teach *upon* (in) the name of Christ (Luke xxiv. 47 ; Acts iv. 17 ; v. 28, 40), i.e. by referring to him as the source of doctrine and authority ; to cast out demons *upon* (in) the name of Christ, Luke ix. 49, i.e. making the efficacy of the exorcising depend on his name (uttered on the occasion as a solemn form) ; baptism *upon* (in) the name of Christ is baptism founded on the acknowledgment of his name, Acts ii. 38 ; to receive any one *upon* (in) the name of Christ, Matt. xviii. 5, i.e. because he bears his name, confesses him, etc.

Special senses of ἐπὶ are

a) *Over*, of superintendence, Luke xii. 44 ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι καταστήσει αὐτόν, cf. Xen. C. 6, 3, 28 (as elsewhere with Gen. Lob. Phryn. p. 474 sq.).

b) *Over*, to, of addition to something already existing, Luke iii. 20 προσέθηκε καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσι, Matt. xxv. 20 ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς in addition to those five talents (if ἐπ' αὐτοῖς is genuine), Luke xvi. 26 ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις *besides, over and above, all this*, Lucian. conscr. hist. 31 ; Aristoph. plut. 628 (cf. Wetsten. and Kypke in loc.). Phil. ii. 17 ; Col. iii. 14 ; Eph. vi. 16 (cf. Polyb. 6, 23, 12). Hence in Jno. iv. 27 ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ *upon this*, as Jesus spoke thus with etc., came the disciples. It is used somewhat differently in 2 Cor. vii. 13 ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει περισσotέρως μᾶλλον ἐχάρημεν *besides my consolation, I rejoiced*, etc.

c) *Over*, of the object after verbs denoting an emotion, as θαυμάζειν, ὠγαλλιᾶν, πενθεῖν, λυπέσθαι, ὀργίζεσθαι, [μακροθυμεῖν], μετανοεῖν, Luke i. 47 ; xviii. 7 ; Mark iii. 5 ; xii. 17 ; Matt. vii. 28 ; Rom. x. 19 ; 2 Cor. xii. 21 ; Rev. xii. 17 ; xviii. 11 (Plat. symp. 217 a. and 206 b. ; Isocr. paneg. 22 ; Lucian. philops. 14 ; Aristot. rhet. 2, 10, 1 ; Palaeph. 1, 8 ; Joseph. antt. 5, 1, 26 a.). With εὐχαριστεῖν it signifies to give thanks *over* (for), 1 Cor. i. 4 ; 2 Cor. ix. 15 ; Phil. i. 3 sq. ; Polyb. 18, 26, 4. It is also employed with verbs of speaking, Rev. x. 11 προφητεῦσαι ἐπὶ λαοῖς (xxii. 16 var.), Jno. xii. 16 ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα (Her. 1, 66 ; Paus. 3, 13, 3 ; 412 cf. Schoemann, Plut. Agis p. 71).

d) *On*, of a supposition or condition (Xen. symp. 1, 5; Diod. S. 2, 24; Lucian. conser. hist. 38; Aesop. 21, 1): *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι* *on* (in) hope, 1 Cor. ix. 10 (Plat. Alcib. 1, 105 b., *ἐπ' ἐλπίσι* Dio Chr. 1003, 21; Herod. 3, 12, 20), Heb. ix. 17 *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς* (*on* one's death) after men are dead, when death has taken place.¹ It is used also of motive, Luke v. 5 *ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι σου χαλάσω τὸ δίκτυον* *on* thy word, induced by thy word, Acts iii. 16 *ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει* *on* account of the faith, xxvi. 6; Matt. xix. 9 (1 Cor. viii. 11 var.);² cf. Xen. Mem. 3, 14, 2; Cyr. 1, 3, 16; 1, 4, 24; 4, 5, 14; Her. 1, 137; Lucian. Hermot. 80; Isocr. areop. 336; Dio Chr. 29, 293. Hence *ἐφ' ᾧ* *wherefore, on which account*, Diod. S. 19, 98 (*ἐφ' ᾧπερ* Dio C. 43, 95, etc.), and *because* 2 Cor. v. 4; Rom. v. 12; probably also Phil. iii. 12 (*on this account that, for ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι* see Fr. Rom. I. 299 sq.), *eo quod*.³

e) *To, for*, of aim and issue, 1 Thess. iv. 7 *οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ* *to uncleanness*, Gal. v. 13 (like *καλεῖν ἐπὶ ξενίᾳ* Xen. An. 7, 6, 3, and the like; see Sintenis, Plutarch. Them. p. 147), 2 Tim. ii. 14; Eph. ii. 10, cf. Xen. An. 5, 7, 34; Mem. 2, 3, 19; Plat. rep. 8, 389 b.; Diod. S. 2, 24; Arrian. Alex. 1, 26, 4; 2, 18, 9; Diog. L. 1, 7, 2; cf. Index to Dio C. ed. Sturz p. 148 sq., according to some *ἐφ' ᾧ* Phil. iii. 12 *unto which* (for which).

f) *After*, of the rule, model, Luke i. 59 *καλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι* after the name (Neh. vii. 63). To this head, probably, belongs 352 also Rom. v. 14 *ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ* *ad* (Vulg. 6th ed. *in*) *similitudinem* peccati Ad.; for other explanations, see Meyer. 369 2 Cor. ix. 6, however, we cannot with Philippi (Röm.-Br. S. 172) 7th ed. understand in the same way; see above, p. 392.

When *ἐπί* with Dat. in a local sense is joined to a verb of direction or motion (Matt. ix. 16; Jno. viii. 7, not Matt. xvi. 18; Acts iii. 11), the phrase 413 includes together with the idea of motion that of tarrying and resting also.

d. *Παρά* *beside* i.e. properly *near, at the side of*, used of place, with the Dative of the thing only in Jno. xix. 25 (Soph. Oed. C.

¹ Yet several of these passages may be referred to the more general signification *at, with* (see above), as is done by Fr. Rom. I. 315.

² Ἀπολείται ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἀδελφὸς ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ γνώσει (where, however, good authorities [Sin also] read ἐν) is, properly, *perishes on thy knowledge* i.e. because thy knowledge is urged, — briefly, *through* thy knowledge. But *ἐπὶ* does not therefore, as Grotius Rom. v. 12 maintains, strictly mean *through*.

³ The Greeks usually employ the Plural, *ἐφ' οἷς* (but *ἐπὶ τῷδε* Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 211). Rothe (Versuch über Röm. v. 12 ff. p. 17 ff.) has recently asserted that in the N. T. this *ἐφ' ᾧ* should be uniformly rendered *on the supposition, on the understanding, on condition, that, in as far as*. There is no passage, however, in which this would not be artificial and forced; cf. Rückert, Comment. zu Röm. 2 Aufl. I. 262.

1160; Plato Ion 535 b.), elsewhere with the Dat. of the person (Krü. 299); sometimes denoting

a) What is externally *near*, *by*, *with*, Luke ix. 47, or what is in one's vicinity, province, custody, 2 Tim. iv. 13 *φελόνην ἀπέλιπον παρὰ Κάρπῳ*, 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (Aristot. pol. 1, 7), Luke xix. 7 (where *παρὰ ἁμαρτ.* belongs to *καταλύσαι*), Col. iv. 16; Rev. ii. 13; Acts x. 6; xviii. 3. Sometimes, and more frequently,

b) In reference to what is *ideally near* one, in one's possession, power, capacity, etc. (*penes*); as, *Matt. xix. 26 *παρὰ ἀνθρώπους τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν, παρὰ δὲ θεῷ πάντα δυνατά*, Rom. ii. 11 *οὐ γάρ ἐστι προσωποληψία παρὰ θεῷ*, ix. 14; Luke i. 37 (*παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ* is a clerical mistake) cf. Demosth. cor. 352 a. *εἰ ἐστι παρ' ἐμοί τις ἐμπειρία*, Jas. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 17, especially of the judgment, Acts xxvi. 8 *τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν* etc. (apud vos), Rom. xii. 16 *μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς* (Prov. iii. 7) before yourselves (as judges), in your own estimation, in your own eyes, 1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 8 (Her. 1, 32; Plato Theaet. 170 d.; Soph. Trach. 586; Eurip. Bacch. 399, and Electr. 737; Bhdv. 257). So likewise 2 Pet. ii. 11 *οὐ φέρουσι κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίῳ* (before the Lord as Judge) *βλάσφημον κρίσω* were the words π. κυρ. genuine, and, substantially, 1 Cor. vii. 24 *ἕκαστος ἐν ᾧ ἐκλήθη, ἐν τούτῳ μενέτω παρὰ θεῷ* *with, before God*, on the plane of God's judgment. That *παρά* with the Dat. denotes strictly direction *towards*,¹ cannot be established (Wahl in his *Clav.*) by Luke ix. 47, still less by Luke xix. 7 (see a) above).

e. *Πρός* has the same primary import as *παρά*, but is used in the N. T. only in its local sense: *at, by, in the* (immediate) *vicinity of*; as, Jno. xviii. 16 *πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ*, xx. 11, 12; Mark v. 11 (to 414 adduce instances of the same use of *πρός* from Greek authors would be superfluous; for the assertion of Münster, *Symbol. ad intptat. ev. Joa. p. 31*, is untrue). So likewise Rev. i. 13 *περιζωσμένος πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην* girded about *at* the breasts with a girdle (Xen. C. 7, 1, 33). In Luke xix. 37 *ἐγγίζοντος ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν* is to be rendered: as he was 370 already close *to* etc. (In the Sept. *πρός* with the Dative occurs ^{7th ed.} much more frequently than in the N. T.)

f. *Περί* and *ὑπό* are never used in the N. T. with the Dative.

¹ If *παρά* with the Dat. is employed with a verb of motion, the same attraction must be acknowledged which occurs when *ἐν* is so used. But in Xen. A. 2, 5, 27, which Kühner adduces as the only instance, recent editors on the authority of Codd. give *παρὰ Τισσαφέρνην*. On the other hand, see Plutarch. Themist. c. 5 and *Sintenis* in loc. It cannot, however, be denied that in the Dative itself the notion of *whither* is originally contained (p. 214). Cf. *Hartung über d. Casus. S. 81*.

353

§ 49. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE ACCUSATIVE.

6th ed.

a. *Eis* (the opposite of *ék* Rom. i. 17; v. 16).

a) In the *local* sense it denotes not merely *into*, *in among* (Luke x. 36; Acts iv. 17, likewise Mark xiii. 14 *eis* τὰ ὄρη as we say, *into the mountains*), or (of countries and cities) *to* (into) Matt. xxviii. 16; Acts x. 5; xii. 19, etc., but also (of levels) *on* Mark xi. 8 *ἐστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν*, Acts xxvi. 14; Rev. ix. 3, and even simply *to* (ad), *thitherward* (of motion or direction) Mark iii. 7 (Polyb. 2, 23, 1), Matt. xxi. 1; Jno. xi. 38 *ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον* cometh *to* the tomb, cf. vs. 41; iv. 5 cf. vs. 28; xx. 1 cf. vs. 11; Acts ix. 2; Luke vi. 20 *ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς* towards his disciples, Rev. x. 5 (*εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*) Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 11; Aeschin. dial. 2, 2 In reference to persons it hardly signifies *to* (*πρός* or *ὡς* Mdv. 33; Bhdy. 215), but *among*, *inter*, Acts xx. 29; xxii. 21; Luke xi. 49; Rom. v. 12; xvi. 26; Plato Prot. 349 a.; Gorg. 526 b. (when it occasionally approaches the import of the Dative, Luke xxiv. 47, see above, § 31, 5);¹ in one passage, into a person's house, Acts xvi. 40 *εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν Λυδῖαν* (according to many [minuscule] Codd.) see Valcken. in loc. cf. Lys. orat. 2 in. Strabo 17, 796; Fischer, Well. III. II. p. 150; Schoem. Isae. 363, and Plutarch. Agis p. 124, (but the better Codd. [Sin. also] give *πρός*).

415 b) Applied to *time*, *eis* signifies sometimes a point, limit *for*, *at* which Acts iv. 3 (Herod. 3, 5, 2), or *up to*, *till* which, Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Tim. i. 12;² sometimes a period (*for*, *during*, like *ἐπὶ*) Luke xii. 19 *εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη* (Xen. M. 3, 6, 13).

c) Used tropically, of *ideal* relations, it denotes any *aim* or *end*; as, Acts xxviii. 6 *μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον* unto, towards (on) him, cf. Plut. Moral. p. 786 c.; hence, α. the *measure*, amount (Bhdy. 218) which something reaches, 2 Cor. x. 13 *εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχᾶσθαι*, iv. 17 (Lucian. dial. mort. 27, 7), cf. also the well-known *εἰς μάλιστα* and *εἰς τρίς*. β. the *condition* into which something is brought, Acts ii. 20; Rev. xi. 6; Heb. vi. 6; cf. like-
371 wise Eph. ii. 21 f. γ. the *result*, Rom. x. 10 (xiii. 14), 1 Cor.
7th ed. xi. 17 *εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον συνέρχεσθε*. δ. the *direction of the feelings*

¹ Likewise in 1 Cor. xiv. 36; 2 Cor. x. 14 *eis* is more appropriate than *πρός*, inasmuch as in all these passages ideal reaching to one (his knowledge or intercourse with him) is spoken of.

² (The more expressive) *ἕως* (or *μέχρι*) is oftener used in this sense; and many passages adduced in Lexicons under the signification *usque ad* are not purely temporal, but include the *eis* of purpose, aim, Gal. iii. 17, 23; Eph. iv. 30.

views, etc. and the deportment *towards* (*erga* and *contra*), 1 Pet. iv. 9 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους, Rom. viii. 7 (Her. 6, 65), xii. 16; Matt. xxvi. 10; 3 Jno. 5; Col. iii. 9; 2 Cor. viii. 24; x. 1; Luke xii. 10, to which sense likewise Col. i. 20 ἀποκαταλλάττειν τι εἰς αὐτόν may be referred (cf. διαλλάττειν πρὸς τινα Demosth. ep. 3, 354 p. 114; Thuc. 4, 59 etc.);¹ further, the direction both of the thoughts, Acts ii. 25 Δαυὶδ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν *aiming at* (referring to) *him* (dicere in aliquem, cf. Kypke in loc.), Eph. i. 10; v. 32; Heb. vii. 14; cf. Acts xxvi. 6,² and of the desires (*after* something) Phil. i. 23 and of the will in general; and then, the occasion Matt. xii. 41 εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ *at* the preaching; the purpose and end in view (Bhdy. 219) Luke v. 4 χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν *for* a draught (to catch), 2 Cor. ii. 12 ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *for the gospel* i.e. in order to publish it, Acts ii. 38; vii. 5; Rom. v. 21; vi. 19; viii. 15; ix. 21; xiii. 14; xvi. 19; Heb. x. 24; xii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 12; 2 Cor. ii. 16; vii. 9; Gal. ii. 8; Phil. i. 25 (εἰς ὃ *for which* Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. i. 11; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 8, εἰς τι Matt. xxvi. 8). In this way are explained also the phrases ἐλπίζειν, πιστεύειν εἰς τινα, as well as the passages in which εἰς relating to persons signifies *for*, Rom. x. 12 πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας, Luke xii. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 1 etc. (and thus borders on the Dat. see a) above), and lastly, the looser connections where εἰς is rendered *in reference to, as respects, with regard to* (Bhdy. 416 220; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 484) Acts xxv. 20; 2 Pet. i. 8; Rom. iv. 20; xv. 2 (of things, Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 1; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 16), 2 Cor. xi. 10; Eph. iii. 16; iv. 15; Rom. xvi. 5 (of persons). Sometimes subjective and objective purpose, aim and effect, cannot be separated, Heb. iv. 16; Luke ii. 34; Rom. xiv. 1; Jude 21. The German *zu, for, to*, includes both.³ Further, cf. § 29, 3 note.

The following alleged significations of εἰς are to be rejected: *Sub* (Rom. xi. 32 cf. Gal. iii. 22); εἰς here retains the signification of *in*, as we can say included *in* just as well as *under*; *With* (of the instrument), in Acts xix. 3 εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα (ἡβαπτίσθημεν) is a direct answer to the question εἰς τί οὖν ἡβαπτίσθητε; strictly the answer should have been, *unto that unto which John baptized*. The expression is abbreviated there-

¹ It is not necessary to consider this phrase pregnant, as Fr. Rom. I. 278 does. It is obviously founded on the same conception as the expression preferred by Greek authors διαλλάττειν πρὸς τινα.

² Likewise ὁμῶσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα Matt. v. 35 is substantially to be referred to this signification; see Fr. in loc.

³ But in Jno. iv. 14 ἀλλομένου εἰς ζῶν ἀθάνατον is probably to be rendered *into*, though BCrusius is of a different opinion.

fore, or rather, inexact. Nor can εἰς be strictly rendered *before*, *coram* in Acts xxii. 30 (see Kühnöl), cf. Heind. Plat. Protag. 471; Stallb. Plat. 372 symp. p. 43 sq.; but ἔστησαν (αὐτὸν) εἰς αὐτούς is: introduced (placed) ^{th ed.} him *among them*, in the midst (εἰς μέσον). In 2 Cor. xi. 6 ἐν παντὶ φανερωθέντες εἰς ὑμᾶς is very nearly: *towards* you (erga), as elsewhere πρὸς is used. That εἰς is ever equivalent to διὰ with Gen. is a fiction; and εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων Acts vii. 53 is most simply rendered *upon the injunctions of angels* (which, indeed, as respects sense amounts to *in consequence of* such injunctions), unless the interpretation proposed § 32, 4 b. p. 228 be preferred. As to εἰς for ἐν see § 50, 4, p. 414 sq.

355 b. 'Ἀνά upon, up along' (Bhdy. 233 f.), occurs in the N. T. ^{th ed.} chiefly in the phrase ἀνὰ μέσον with Gen. of place, *through the midst of*, (*in*) *between*, Mark vii. 31; Matt. xiii. 25, and figuratively with Gen. of a person, 1 Cor. vi. 5 διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. Then, with numerals, in a distributive sense; as, Jno. ii. 6 ὑδρίαὶ χωροῦσαι ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς *containing two or three metretae apiece*, [Matt. xx. 9], Luke ix. 3; x. 1; Mark vi. 40 (where Lchm. [and Tdf.] following Codd. B. [Sin.] give κατὰ); so frequently in Greek authors. The preposition thus gradually assumes the nature of an adverb (Bhdy. 234). This distributive signification probably grew out of such phrases as ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος every year, year by year.

417 Hug, in the Freiburger Zeitschr. VI. 41 f., proposed to render the above passage from John: containing *about* two or three metretae; but he has not succeeded in establishing such a use. In Polyb. 2, 10, 3 and Dio Cass. 59, 2 ἀνά manifestly signifies *each*, *apiece*. In Polyb. 1, 16, 2 nobody will believe that the writer intended to state the strength of the Roman legion indefinitely, as merely '*about*' 4000 foot and 300 cavalry. In Her. 7, 184 ἀνὰ διηκοσίους ἄνδρας λογιζομένοισι ἐν ἐκάστη νηὶ is a pleonastic expression, similar to others of frequent occurrence—200 apiece . . . in each ship, (at the rate of etc.). Rev. iv. 8 ἐν καθ' ἑν αὐτῶν ἔχον ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἑξ is similar. Moreover, the Greeks use ἐπί with the Acc. to express *about*, *for*, a numerical amount.

c. Διὰ with the Acc. indicates the *ground* (ratio), not the design (not even in 1 Cor. vii. 2),² and signifies *on account of* (even in

¹ *Hm. de partic.* § p. 5: Primum ac proprium usum habet in iis, quae in al. rei superficie ab imo ad summum eundo conspiciuntur: motus enim significationem ei adhaerere quum ex eo intelligitur, quod non est apta visa quae cum verbo εἶναι componeretur, tum docet usus ejus adverbialis, ut ἄλλ' ἀνα ἑξ ἐδράνων. Further, cf. *Spitzner de vi et usu praeposit.* ἀνὰ et κατὰ. Viteb. 1831.

² That is to say, it is only *per consequens* that the notion of design is implied in διὰ τὰς πορνείας: *on account of fornications let every man have his own wife*. Fornications are

Jno. vii. 43 ; x. 19 ; xv. 3 etc.), or, when the motive of an action is meant, *out of, from*, Matt. xxvii. 18 διὰ φθόνου *out of (from) envy*, Eph. ii. 4 διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην (Diod. S. 19, 54 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἡτυχηκότας ἔλεον, Aristot. rhet. 2, 13 ; Demosth. Conon. 730 c.). As to Rom. iii. 25, which even Reiche has misunder- 373 stood, see Bengel. In Heb. v. 12 διὰ τὸν χρόνον is, *on account* ^{7th ed.} *of* the time, considering the time (you have enjoyed Christian instruction ;¹ not, as Schulz renders it, *after* so long a time).

Sometimes διὰ with Acc. denotes apparently the means (ground or motive and means are very closely connected, cf. Demosth. cor. 354 a. ; Xen. M. 3, 3, 15 ; Liv. 8, 53 ; and in the poets διὰ is sometimes used with the Acc. even in a local sense, see Bhdy. 236) : Jno. vi. 57 κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὁ τρώγων με ζήσεται 356 ^{8th ed.} *δι' ἐμέ*, just as in Long. pastor. 2 p. 62 Schaef. διὰ τὰς νύμφας ^{8th ed.} *ἔζησε*, Plut. Alex. 668 e. But the passage strictly means, *I live by reason of the Father*, that is, because the Father lives, cf. Plat. conv. 283 e. ; Fr. Rom. I. 197, who adduces as parallel Cic. Rosc. Am. 22, 63 ut, *propter quos* hanc suavissimam lucem adspexerit, eos indignissime luce privaret. Passages more or less similar are Demosth. Zenoth. 576 a. ; Aristoph. Plut. 470 ; Aeschin. dial. 1, 2 ; 418 Dion. H. III. 1579 ; cf. Wyttenb. Plut. Mor. II. p. 2 Lips. ; Sintenis, Plutarch. Themist. 121 ; Thuc. ed. Poppe III. II. 517. But Heb. v. 14 ; vi. 7 by no means belong here, nor (as de Wette and Ewald still maintain) Rev. xii. 11 ἐνίκησαν διὰ τὸ αἷμα, cf. vii. 14 and what immediately follows, καὶ οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν etc. As to Rom. viii. 11 (where the reading, indeed, varies) see Fr., and as to Jno. xv. 3 Mey. in loc. In 2 Cor. iv. 5 ; Heb. ii. 9 ; 2 Pet. ii. 2 (where Schott still renders it by *per*, which gives a false sense even ; Bengel otherwise) Rev. iv. 11, διὰ is quite appropriately translated *for the sake of*. So too in Rom. viii. 20² (where Schott has *per* again). But in Rom. xv. 15 διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι

the ground of this regulation, inasmuch as they are to be prevented. In Greek authors also design sometimes in the same way attaches itself to διὰ ; see the annotators on Thuc. 4, 40 and 102.

¹ The phrase is used thus, essentially, in Polyb. 2, 21, 2 and elsewhere, see Bleek on the above passage. Schulz insists in applying the temporal sense of διὰ to Heb. ii. 9 likewise. But διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου means, on account of the suffering of death, and is elucidated from the well-known connection, recognized by the apostolic writers, between the sufferings and the exaltation of Christ.

² Here διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα constitutes an antithesis to οὐχ ἑκούσα, *not voluntarily*, but *by reason of him that subjected*,—by the will and command of God. Probably Paul intentionally avoided saying διὰ τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος, equivalent to ὁ θεὸς ὑπέταξε αὐτήν. Adam's sin was the proper and direct cause of the *ματαιότης*.

the preposition must not, in consideration of xii. 3 διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, be understood in this sense; both expressions are proper. 1 Jno. ii. 12 is correctly rendered by Lücke. 2 Pet. ii. 2 needs no comment. In 2 Pet. iii. 12 δι' ἣν may be referred to ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρα, and translated *on account of*; yet if referred to παρουσία, as is done by Bengel, it gives sense. Lastly, in Gal. iv. 13 δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός is probably not to be understood (Schott) of the state, condition (δι' ἀσθενείας), but means: *on account of* weakness, owing to a weakness; see Mey.

d. Κατά. The local (primary) meaning is,

ρ) *down upon* (down along, cf. Aeschin. dial. 3, 19), passing
 374 on, *through, over* (Xen. C. 6, 2, 22); as, Luke viii. 39 ἀπῆλθε καθ'
 7th ed. ὁδὸν τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων, xv. 14 λιμὸς κατὰ τὴν χώραν *throughout*
the country, all over the country, Acts viii. 1 (2 Macc. iii. 14;
 Strabo 3, 163); Acts v. 15 ἐκφέρειν κατὰ τὰς πλατείας *through the*
streets, along the streets, viii. 36 (Xen. An. 4, 6, 11), Luke ix. 6;
 xiii. 22; Acts xi. 1; xxvii. 2 (Xen. C. 8, 1, 6, Raphel. in loc.).¹
 Uniformly of horizontal extension. So even in Acts xxvi. 3 τὰ
 419 κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἔθνη καὶ ζητήματα *the customs etc. extending*
throughout the Jews (common among the Jews).²

357 b) *on to, towards*, Phil. iii. 14 (κατὰ σκοπὸν *towards the mark*),
 6th ed. Acts viii. 26; xvi. 7; Luke x. 32 (Aesop. 88, 4; Xen. C. 8, 5, 17);
 likewise merely of the direction (geographical position, *versus*),
 Acts ii. 10 τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην, xxvii. 12 λιμένα βλέποντα
 κατὰ Λίβα (Xen. An. 7, 2, 1). Accordingly, κατὰ πρόσωπόν τινος
 signifies *to one's face* i.e. *before* one's eyes, Luke ii. 31; Acts iii. 13;
 so also κατ' ὀφθαλμούς Gal. iii. 1 (Xen. Hist. 1, 14 like κατ' ὄμμα
 Eurip. Androm. 1064, κατ' ὄμματα Soph. Ant. 756). Likewise in
 Rom. viii. 27 κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνειν does not mean (in a local
 sense) *apud deum*, but, properly, *towards God, before God*.³

¹ Κατὰ in its local signification is not properly synonymous with ἐν (as even Kühnöl on Acts xi. 1 asserts). Κατὰ τὴν πόλιν means, *throughout the city*; καθ' ὁδὸν *along the road*, on the road (as on a line). Even κατ' οἶκον, where the primary meaning recedes farthest from view, is used to express a different conception from ἐν οἴκῳ (as zu Hause, *at home* is different from im Hause, *in the house*). Besides, κατὰ has established itself in many phrases where probably ἐν might have been used.

² Hence comes the meaning *with, among*, as of καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιεῖται Acts xvii. 28, cf. xiii. 1 and other passages; see above, p. 193. Κατὰ with a personal pronoun is employed thus, especially in later authors, as merely a circumlocution for a possessive pronoun; see Hase, Leo Diac. p. 230.

³ Against this explanation, adopted also by Fr. Krehl and others, various objections have recently been raised, particularly by Mey. and Philippi. The most unimportant of all is that then κατ' αὐτόν would be used. The emphasis implied in the substantive

Closely connected with this is the *temporal* use of the preposition, sometimes as in Acts xvi. 25 *κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον towards midnight*, and sometimes as in Matt. xxvii. 15 *καθ' ἑορτήν during the festival*, i. 20 *κατ' ὄναρ during a dream*, *secundum quietem* (Herod. 2, 7, 6, *κατὰ φῶς by daylight* Xen. C. 3, 3, 25, *κατὰ βίον* Plato, Gorg. 488 a.), Heb. ix. 9 also iii. 8 (Sept.) *κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ in the day etc.*, and *κατὰ τὸ αὐτό at the same time* Acts xiv. 1.

Hence it is employed of both place and time in a distributive sense, first with plural nouns, as *κατὰ φυλάς by tribes*, Matt. xxiv. 7 *κατὰ τόπους*, Acts xxii. 19, *κατὰ δύο in pairs* 1 Cor. xiv. 27 (Plato, ep. 6, 323 c.), Mark vi. 40 var.; afterwards frequently with singular nouns, as in Acts xv. 21 *κατὰ πόλιν from city to city* (Diod. S. 19, 77; Plutarch. Cleom. 25; Dio Chr. 16, 461; Palaeph. 52, 7), *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν yearly* Heb. ix. 25 (Plato, pol. 298 e.; Xen. C. 8, 6, 375 16, *κατὰ μῆνα* Xen. An. 1, 9, 17; Dio C. 750, 74), *καθ' ἡμέραν daily* Acts ii. 46; 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (Hm. Vig. 860).¹

Used *figuratively* *κατά* is the preposition of reference and direction to something: either generally, as in Eph. vi. 21 *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ quae ad me pertinent*, Acts xxv. 14, or in limitation of a general expression (Her. 1, 49; Soph. Trach. 102 and 379) Eph. vi. 5 *οἱ κατὰ σάρκα κύριοι as respects the flesh*, so far as concerns the flesh, Rom. ix. 5 *ἐξ ὧν (Ἰουδαίων) ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* (1 Pet. iv. 14), Acts iii. 22; Rom. vii. 22 also xi. 28 and xvi. 25; or specially

a) the measure, the standard, *according to, in conformity to*, as in Eph. iv. 7; Matt. xxv. 15; Jno. ii. 6; Luke ii. 22 *κατὰ νόμον*, Heb. ix. 19 (Xen. Cyr. 5, 5, 6), Acts xxvi. 5; Rom. xi. 21 *κατὰ φύσιν*, Matt. ix. 29 *κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν according to your faith*, as it deserves, 2 Cor. iv. 13; Rom. ii. 2 *κατὰ ἀλήθειαν*, Matt. ii. 16 *κατὰ χρόνον according to the time*. Hence it denotes similarity, sort (pattern), Heb. viii. 8f. *συντελέσω . . . διαθήκην καινὴν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἐποίησα etc.* (1 Kings xi. 10), Acts xviii. 14. Likewise with names of persons *κατά τινα* usually signifies according to some one's opinion Col. ii. 8 (Eph. ii. 2); 2 Cor. xi. 17, or will Rom. xv. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 8; cf. Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 91, or

is easily felt, and is indicated visibly, too, by the position of *κατὰ θεόν*, though the point of principal moment lies in *ὡς ἐπὶ ἀγίων*. The translation, *according to God*, introduces an entirely unnecessary idea into the passage, since of the Spirit no different intercession can be thought of.

¹ Also *καθ' ἑαυτὸν for one's self* is usually referred to this use (see e.g. *Passow*), but erroneously, as the phrase is not distributive. *Καθ' ἑαυτὸν*, and the like, properly means *in reference to one's self*, whereby something is restricted to a single subject; hence *for one's self*, adv. *seorsum*. As to *ἐχειν κ. ἑαυτὸν*, see Fr. Rom. III. 212.

according to some one's pattern and example, as in Gal. iv. 28 *κατὰ Ἰσαάκ* in the same way as Isaac, ad exemplum Isaaci, 1 Pet. i. 15; Eph. iv. 24 (Plato, Parm. 126 c.; Lucian. pisc. 6, 12; eunuch. 13; Dio C. 376, 59; cf. Kypke and Wetst. on Gal. as above, Marle, floril. p. 61 sq.). It is used of authors: τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον the gospel (the evangelic history) as recorded by Matthew (according to Matthew's understanding and exposition of it). As to εἶναι κατὰ σάρκα, κατὰ πνεῦμα Rom. viii. 5, see the expositors. In the (Pauline) phrase κατ' ἄνθρωπον *after the manner of man*, in (ordinary) human fashion, (with contexts of various descriptions), κατὰ is used more generally: Rom. iii. 5; Gal. i. 11; iii. 15; 1 Cor. ix. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 6 (see Wiesing. in loc.), see Fr. Rom. I. 159 sq.¹ Cf. in connection with the same use of κατὰ, 421 Rom. iv. 4 κατὰ χάριν by way of grace, 1 Cor. ii. 1 καθ' ὑπεροχὴν 376 λόγου, Phil. iii. 6; Eph. vi. 6; Rom. xiv. 15; Acts xxv. 23 ἀνδράσι 17th ed. τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως.

b) the occasion (and the motive), a sense closely allied to the preceding (hence in Rom. iv. 4 κατὰ χάριν may be rendered also, *of (out of) grace*), Matt. xix. 3 ἀπολύσαι τὴν γυναῖκα κατὰ πάσαν αἰτίαν *for every cause, on every ground* (Kypke in loc., cf. Paus. 5, 10, 2; 6, 18; 2, 7), Rom. ii. 5; Acts iii. 17 κατὰ ἀγνοίαν ἐπράξατε in consequence of ignorance (Raphel. in loc.), Phil. iv. 11 οὐχ ὅτι καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω from (in consequence of suffering) want, Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 3 κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος,² Eph. i. 5; Her. 9, 17 (κατὰ τὸ ἔχθος) etc. cf. Diog. L. 6, 10; Arrian. Al. 1, 17, 13. Also in Heb. xi. 7 ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη the righteousness which proceeds from faith.

c) the intention, purpose, *for, to* (Jno. ii. 6), 2 Tim. i. 1;³ Tit. i. 1 (cf. Rom. i. 5 εἰς), and the (necessary) result, 2 Cor. xi. 21

¹ In 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10 λυπεῖσθαι κατὰ θεόν and λύπη κ. θ. is not sorrow produced by God (Kypke in loc.), but, as Bengel aptly says, animi Deum spectantis et sequentis, to sorrow *according to God* i.e. after the mind and will of God. In the passage that follows Paul might in the same way have written ἡ κατὰ τὸν κόσμον λύπη. But ἡ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη has a meaning somewhat different: the sorrow of the world, i.e. as the world (those who belong to the world) possesses and experiences it (of course about the things of the κόσμος). Bengel in like manner has duly appreciated the difference between these two expressions. In 1 Pet. iv. 6 κατὰ ἀνθρώπους means after the manner of men, and is more closely defined by the annexed σαρκί; just so κατὰ θεόν means after the manner of God, which is more closely defined by πνεύματι (for God is πνεῦμα).

² Accordingly κατὰ sometimes stands parallel to the Dat. (instrum.), as in Arrian. Al. 5, 21, 4 κατ' ἔχθος τὸ Πάρου μᾶλλον ἢ φιλίας τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. See Fr. Rom. I. 99.

³ *Matthies* gives an artificial exposition with the remark that it cannot be shown that κατὰ expresses *object*. This import, however, is very naturally involved in the original meaning of this preposition. Moreover, see *Muh.* 1356, 1359.

κατ' ὑτιμίαν λέγω *to* (as a, by way of) *reproach* (Her. 2, 152; Thuc. 5, 7; 6, 31). The signification *cum* must be rejected, though κατά may sometimes be translated *with*. In Rom x. 2 359 ζήλος θεοῦ ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν is *zeal for God, but not according to knowledge*, i.e. not as zeal resulting from knowledge manifests itself (cf. above, κατ' ἄγνοιαν), 1 Pet. iii. 7. In Heb. xi. 13 κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον etc. means: they died in (*according to*) faith, without having received etc.; it was in accordance with faith (with the nature of πίστις) that they died having seen only from afar the fulfilment of the promises. The idea of κατὰ πίστιν is contained in the second participial clause.

e. Ὑπέρ with Acc. signifies *beyond, away-over* (Her. 4, 188; Plato, Crit. 108 e.; Plut. virt. mul. p. 231 Lips.). In the N. T. it never occurs in reference to place, but is always used figuratively, *beyond, over and above* in number, rank, quality; as, Acts xxvi. 13 φῶς περιλάμψαν . . . ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου, Matt. x. 24 οὐκ ἔστι μαθητῆς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, Philem. 16; Matt. x. 37 ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ (Aesch. dial. 3, 6), 2 Cor. i. 8 (Epict. 31, 37); Gal. i. 14; also 2 Cor. xii. 13 τί γάρ ἐστιν, ὃ ἡγήθητε ὑπὲρ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας *inferior beyond the other churches* (gradation 422 downwards). Concerning ὑπὲρ after comparatives, see § 35, 1.

f. Μετά denotes motion *into the midst of* something, Iliad 2, 376. Then it signifies motion *after, behind*, something; in prose, however, it more frequently means *behind, after* (post) of a state of rest, Heb. ix. 3 μετὰ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα (Paus. 3, 1, 1). In all other passages of the N. T. where it occurs it signifies *after* in regard to time, (the opposite of πρό), even in Matt. xxvii. 63 — where the popular expression presents no difficulty, see Krebs, obs. p. 87 sq. — and 1 Cor. xi. 25 μετὰ τὸ δευπνήσαι, which must 377 not, in consideration of Matt. xxvi. 26 (ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν), be rendered by *during*; on the other hand, cf. Luke xxii. 20. So too, the familiar expression μεθ' ἡμέραν *interdiu* (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. 4, 13, 10) properly denotes *post lucem*, after daybreak.

g. Παρά. The primary import is *beside, along*, of a line or extended space, Matt. iv. 18 περιπατῶν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν . . . εἶδε etc. *walking along the sea-side* (Xen. C. 5, 4, 41; A. 4, 6, 4; 6, 2, 1; Plato Gorg. 511 e.), xiii. 4 ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν *fell (along) by the wayside*. Then it is used also of a point of space, — belonging, however, to an extended object; as, ἔρχεσθαι παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν *to the sea-side* Matt. xv. 29; Acts xvi. 13, ῥίπτειν or τιθέναι παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τ. *to beside the feet* Matt. xv. 30; Acts

iv. 35; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. 356. It is used only thus also with verbs of rest,¹ as of *sitting, standing, lying, (being situated)* *παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν* or *τὴν λίμνην* or *παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν* (*propter mare, viam*) Matt. xx. 30; Luke v. 1 sq.; xviii. 35; Heb. xi. 11; Acts x. 6 ὅ ἐστιν οἰκία παρὰ θάλασσαν (vs. 32), cf. Xen. A. 3, 5, 1; 7, 2, 11; Paus. 1, 38, 9; Aesop. 44, 1; Hartung d. Casus S. 83.

360 Further, *παρὰ* means *beside* the mark or aim, and consequently
6th ed. (as the context may determine), sometimes *above*, as in Rom. xii. 3 (to which Fr. compares Plutarch. Mor. 83 f. *θαυμασταὶ παρ' ὁδοῦ*), sometimes *below*, as in 2 Cor. xi. 24 *πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν* *forty* (with the omission of one) *less one*, Joseph. antt. 4, 8, 1 (cf. Heb. ii. 7 Sept.), Bhdy. 258. In the former sense it is used figuratively,

a) in comparisons, as in Luke xiii. 2 *ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας*
423 *above all* (*more than* all, see *ὑπέρ*, cf. § 35, 2 b.), iii. 13; Heb. i. 9 (Sept.); iii. 3 (Dio Cass. 152, 16; analogous to which is *ἄλλος παρὰ* 1 Cor. iii. 11 *other than*, equivalent to the ordinary *ἄλλος ἢ*, cf. Stallb. Phileb. 51); Rom. xiv. 5 *κρίνειν ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν* *to judge* (esteem) *one day above another*, i.e. to prefer one day to another.

b) *against*: Acts xviii. 13 *παρὰ νόμον* (Xen. M. 1, 1, 18; Lucian. Demon. 49); Rom. i. 26 *παρὰ φύσιν* (*praeter naturam* Plat. rep. 5, 466 d.; Plut. educ. 4, 9); iv. 18 *παρ' ἐλπίδα* (*praeter spem*, Plato pol. 295 d.); xvi. 17; Heb. xi. 11 (Thuc. 3, 54; Xen. A. 2, 5, 41; 5, 8, 17; 6, 4, 28; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 38); compare the expressions *overstep, transgress*, the law. The opposite would be: *κατὰ φύσιν* etc., cf. Xen. M. as above, Plut. educ. 4, 9.

c) in Rom. i. 25 *παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα* *with the omission of the Creator* (consequently, instead of the Creator). In one passage *παρὰ* indicates the ground or reason: 1 Cor. xii. 15 [16] *παρὰ τοῦτο* *therefore*, strictly with (beside) this, since this is so, Weber, Demosth. p. 521 (Plut. Camill. 28; Dio C. 171, 96; Lucian. paras.
378 12 and often). In Latin, as is well-known, *propter* (from *prope*,
7th ed. cf. *propter flumen*) became the ordinary causal preposition, (Vig. p. 862; Vkm. Fritzsche, quaestion. Lucian. p. 124 sq.; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 182).

h. *Πρὸς* *to, towards*, with verbs of motion or mere direction (Acts iv. 24; Eph. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 12 *πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον*

¹ Such expressions as Polyb. 1, 55, 7 *ἐν τῇ παρὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν κειμένη πλευρῇ τῆς Σικελίας* situated (extending) towards, alongside of, Italy, constitute the transition to this use of the preposition.

face turned to face). Sometimes the force of the Acc. seems to disappear and *πρός* means *with*, particularly before names of persons, as in Matt. xiii. 56; Jno. i. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 6 (Demosth. Apat. 579 a.); even here, however, *πρός* denotes (ideal) annexation. But the appropriateness of the Acc. is still perceptible in Mark iv. 1 ὁ ὄχλος *πρός τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἣν* on the land *towards the sea* (by the sea-side), ii. 2; still more in Acts v. 10; xiii. 31; Phil. iv. 6; see Fr. Mr. p. 201 sq., cf. Schoem. Isae. p. 244. The Latin *ad*, as is well-known, has both significations.

The *temporal* applications *πρός καιρόν* *for a time* Luke viii. 13; Jno. v. 35; Heb. xii. 10 f., and *πρός ἑσπέραν* *towards evening* Luke xxiv. 29 (Wetst. I. 826), are seen at a glance to be warranted; (cf. above, ἐπὶ § 47, g, d) p. 375, and § 48, c. p. 392).

Figuratively, *πρός* denotes the end towards which something is directed, and consequently the result, issue, as 2 Pet. iii. 16 ἀ... *στρεβλοῦσιν* ... *πρός τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν*, Heb. v. 14; ix. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 7 (Simplic. in Epict. 13 p. 146), Jno. xi. 4; but especially the direction of the mind towards something, e.g. Heb. i. 7 424 *πρός τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει* *in reference to* (speaking with regard to them), Luke xx. 19; Rom. x. 21 (not Heb. xi. 18), like *dicere in aliquem*; cf. Plutarch. de ei ap. Delph. c. 21; Xen. M. 4, 2, 15;—*in particular*

a) disposition *towards* one, *erga* and *contra*,¹ as in Luke xxiii. 12; 361 1 Thess. v. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 2; vii. 12; Acts vi. 1; Heb. xii. 4; Col. 6th ed iv. 5; Rev. xiii. 6.

b) design (direction of the will) and object (purpose, behalf), as in 1 Cor. x. 11; xii. 7; Matt. vi. 1; Heb. vi. 11; Acts xxvii. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 12. Hence *πρός τί* *wherefore* (quo consilio) Jno. xiii. 28; cf. Soph. Aj. 40.

c) consideration *for* something, Matt. xix. 8 *Μωσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν* etc. out of regard to, *on account of*, the hardness of your hearts (Polyb. 5, 27, 4; 38, 3, 10).

d) the rule *after, according to*, which one is guided, Luke xii. 47; Gal. ii. 14; 2 Cor. v. 10; Lucian. conscr. hist. 38; Plat. apol. 40 e.; Aeschin. dial. 3, 17; and hence the standard *according to* which a comparison is instituted, as in Rom. viii. 18 οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ *πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι* compared to, as if applied to a standard of comparison, Bar. iii. 36 (Thuc.

¹ Thus used but seldom except in verbs already containing the notion of hostility, as in Sext. Empir. 3, 2 (Dio C. 250, 92). This remark is necessary to qualify the statement in my Observatt. in. epist. Jac. p. 16.

6, 31; Plat. Gorg. 471 e.; Hipp. maj. 281 d.; Isocr. big. p. 842; Aristot. pol. 2, 9, 1; Demosth. ep. 4, 119 a; cf. Wolf, Leptin. p. 251; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 340).

379 That in such expressions as διατίθεσθαι διαθήκην πρὸς τινα, διακρίνεσθαι
 7th ed. πρὸς τινα, εἰρήνην ἔχειν πρὸς τινα (Rom. v. 1), κοινωνία πρὸς τι 2 Cor. vi. 14 (cf. Philo ad Caium 1007; Himer. eclog. 18, 3) etc. (see Alberti, observ. p. 303; Fr. Rom. I. 252) the preposition drops the meaning *cum*,¹ and signifies simply *towards*, has already been acknowledged by Bretschn. and Wahl. Also in Heb. iv. 13 πρὸς ὃν ἡμῶν ὁ λόγος, the preposition denotes direction; and Kühnöl. might have reserved his remark, 'πρὸς signifies *cum*' (cf. Elsner in loc.). Schleusner's rendering of the phrase εἵχεσθαι πρὸς θεόν by *precari a deo*, deserves to be mentioned only as a striking instance of unlimited empiricism.

i. Περί about, around. Primarily of place, as in Acts xxii. 6 περιεστράψαι φῶς περὶ ἐμέ a light shone round about me, Luke 425. xiii. 8; also with verbs of rest, as in Mark iii. 34 οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν καθήμενοι, Matt. iii. 4 εἶχε ζώνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν about his loins. Then of time, as in Mark vi. 48 περὶ τετάρτην φυλακὴν about the fourth watch (*circa* in Latin), Matt. xx. 3 (Aeschin. ep. 1, 121 b.); Acts xxii. 6. Lastly, of the object around which an action or a state revolves, as it were, as in Acts xix. 25 οἱ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐργάται (Xen. Vectig. 4, 28); Luke x. 40 (Lucian. indoct. 6); 1 Tim. vi. 4 νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις (Plat. Phaed. 228 e.). Hence it is sometimes equivalent to *in reference to*, as in Tit. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 19; 2 Tim. iii. 8 (Xen. Mem. 4, 3, 2; Isocr. Evag. 4; errorem *circa* literas habuit, and similar expressions, occur in Quintil. and Sueton.). Cf. above, § 30, 3, note 5 p. 192, and Ast, Plat. legg. p. 37; but especially Glossar. Theodoret. p. 317 sqq. Worthy of notice, further, is the phrase οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον Paul and his companions 362 Acts xiii. 13,² like οἱ περὶ Ξενοφῶντα Xen. An. 7, 4, 16, οἱ περὶ
 6th ed. Κέκροπα Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 10, an expression which in later authors denotes the leader alone, Hm. Vig. 700. So probably in Jno. xi. 19

¹ *Merá* in such phrases is used also by Greek authors, though this use seems to become more common in the later language, Malal. 2, 52 ἐπολέμησαν μετ' ἀλλήλων, 13 p. 317, 337; 18 p. 457.

² Greek writers, as is well known, employ ἀμφὶ likewise in this circumlocution; but in simple prose *περὶ* is in general far more frequent. That the expression οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον means not only the 'surroundings' (followers, companions, etc.) of Paul, but also includes Paul himself, arises probably from the pictorial nature of the preposition, which denotes *what encompasses*, and thus Paul's company. An expression somewhat analogous to this is used in German, e.g. Müllers (genit.) i.e. Müller and his household. (In Franconia they say, die Müllerschen, *the Müllers*, also including the head of the family.)

αἱ περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν is to be interpreted; for the *αὐταῖς* following can only refer to the two sisters. Examples (but without precise discrimination) are adduced also by Wetst. I. 915 sq.; Schwarz, Comment. p. 1074; Schweigh. Lexic. Polyb. p. 463. See also Bhdy. 263.

k. Ὑπό originally denotes local motion, *underneath*, Matt. viii. 8 *ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς*, Luke xiii. 34 *ἐπισυνάξαι τὴν νοσοσὶαν* 380 *ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας* (Xen. C. 5, 4, 43; Plutarch. Thes. 3); also rest, ^{7th ed.} i.e. the being (extending) *under* a surface, as in Acts ii. 5 *οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν*, Luke xvii. 24 (Plat. ep. 7, 326 c.), 1 Cor. x. 1 (Her. 2, 127; Plut. Themist. 26; Aesop. 36, 3),¹ also in Rom. iii. 13 (Sept.) *ὡς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν* *under* their lips (cf. Her. 1, 12. *κατακρύπτειν ὑπὸ τὴν θύρην*). Then figuratively (Bhdy. 267; Boissonade, Nic. p. 56), Rom. vii. 14 *πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* *sold under sin*, into the power of sin, Matt. viii. 9 *ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαντὸν στρατιώτας* (Xen. C. 8, 8, 5) *under me* i.e. subject to my power, 1 Pet. v. 6; often in the phrase *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ τι* to be under, 426 given up to, something, Matt. viii. 9; Rom. iii. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 1; Gal. iii. 10; iv. 2, 21 (Lucian. abdic. 23). It is applied to time in Acts v. 21 *ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον* (Lucian. amor. 1) *close upon, towards* (like the local expression *ὑπὸ τὸ τεῖχος*). Similar instances are of frequent occurrence in Greek authors; as, *ὑπὸ νύκτα*, *ὑπὸ τὴν ἔω* etc. (see Alberti, observ. p. 224; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 146; Schweigh. Lexic. Polyb. p. 633). The Romans, too, use *sub* in the same way.

l. Ἐπὶ 1) Of place: motion *upon* (*over* a level surface) Matt. xxvii. 45 *σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*, xiv. 19 *ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοὺς χόρτους*, Acts vii. 11 (xvii. 26); *on* or *to*, coming from above or below, accordingly *down upon* Matt. x. 29 *ἐπὶ γῆν*, Acts iv. 33, *up upon* Acts x. 9 *ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα*, Matt. xxiv. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 24 (Xen. C. 3, 1, 4), also *on* (*upon*) Jno. xiii. 25 *ἐπιπίπτειν ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος* *on* the breast (Jno. xxi. 20); *up before* (a high court) Matt. x. 18; Luke xii. 11; in general, of the end *towards, after, at* (which one advances, strives, arrives, etc.) Luke xv. 4; xxii. 52; Acts viii. 36; Phil. iii. 14 (var.) Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 39; An. 6, 2, 2; Kypke in loc., rarely merely *to* (of persons) Mark v. 21; Acts i. 21.² 363 From this primary import we may easily explain the application ^{6th ed.}

¹ Accordingly Eurip. Alcest. 907 *λῦπαί τε φίλων τῶν ὑπὸ γαίῳ*, which Monk changed into *ὕπὸ γαίας*, may probably be tolerated. Cf. *Matthiae*, Eurip. Hec. 144. The phrase is certainly not peculiar to later Greek (Palaeph. 10, 1).

² From such passages must be distinguished Luke x. 9 *ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὧμᾶς ἡ βασιλεὶα τοῦ θεοῦ*. Here a heavenly gift is spoken of which comes *down* on men; cf. Acts i. 8.

of the preposition in Acts x. 10 ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔκστασις (v. 5), i. 26 ἔπεσεν δὲ κληρὸς ἐπὶ Ματθαίαν, v. 28 ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐπὶ τινα τὸ αἷμα ἀνθρώπου τινός, Jno. i. 33 and elsewhere. The German *auf*, almost universally applicable as it is, is very similar (only, in rendering Matt. xxvii. 29 ἐπέθηκαν κύλαμον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν, a German would say, *in die rechte Hand*; better Codd., however, [Sin. also] give ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ, and the common reading cannot be defended by Rev. xx. 1). It is only in appearance that ἐπὶ with the Acc. is joined to verbs of rest; as in Matt. xiii. 2 ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγυάλον εἰστήκει *stood* (had placed themselves) *upon the shore*, cf. Odyss. 11, 577; Diod. S. 20, 7. In Matt. xix. 28 καθίσεσθε ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους (Paus. 1, 35, 2), 2 Cor. iii. 15 κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν κεῖται, Acts x. 17; 381 xi. 11, the same remark applies to the use of ἐπὶ as to that of ^{7th ed.} εἰς in similar circumstances; see § 50, 4 b.; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. II. 91.¹

427 2) Of the time *over* which something extends; as, Luke iv. 25 ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία *for, during*, three years, Acts xiii. 81; xix. 10; Heb. xi. 30; cf. Her. 3, 59; 6, 101; Thuc. 2, 25; Xen. C. 6, 2, 34; Plat. legg. 12, 945 b.; Strabo 9, 401. Hence ἐφ' ὅσον Matt. ix. 15; 2 Pet. i. 13 (Polyaen. 6, 22) *as long as*. More rarely of the point of time *towards* which, *at* which, something takes place, Acts iii. 1 see Alberti in loc.

3) Figuratively; a) of the number and degree to which something amounts, as in Rev. xxi. 16 ἐπὶ σταδίου δώδεκα χιλιάδων — where we use *up to* (Her. 4, 198; Xen. C. 7, 5, 8; Polyb. 4, 39, 4) Rom. xi. 13 ἐφ' ὅσον *in quantum* i.e. *quatenus*. b) of superin-

¹ Jas. v. 14 προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ' αὐτόν may mean *let them pray over* (upon) *him* (folding their hands over him in prayer, cf. Acts xix. 13), or *pray down upon him*, or even *over him*, for ἐπὶ is very often used with Acc. where the Dat. or Gen. might have been expected. A recent expositor should not have rejected this exposition so lightly. In Luke v. 25 ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο (as the best Codd. [Sin. also] read) may be explained either according to the preceding remark, or thus: *upon (over) which (a level) he lay*. Moreover what is said above seems sufficient to justify the reading, furnished by good authority [also by Cod. Sin.] and already adopted by Lchm., in Jno. xxi. 4 ἵστη ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγυάλον (cf. Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 68, see above in the text), which Matthäi erroneously calls a *semi-graecam correctionem*. Elsewhere certainly the difference between ἐπὶ with Acc. and ἐπὶ with Gen. or Dat. is sometimes inconsiderable. When it is supposed, however, that in Mark xv. 24 (we also say *über die Kleidung* loosen) Phil. ii. 27 (sorrow *upon* sorrow — so that one sorrow comes upon another already present) the Acc. stands for the Gen. or Dat., a closer examination of the passages shows at once the incorrectness of the supposition. But in Luke xxiii. 28; Rev. xviii. 11 the Dat. also might certainly have been employed, cf. Luke xix. 41; Rev. xviii. 20, and in Rev. v. 1 the Acc. would have been even more correct. These two constructions, though, are based on somewhat different views of the matter. We also say *über eine Sache* freuen (to rejoice *over* a thing).

tendence and power *over*, Rev. xiii. 7 ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φυλήν, Heb. iii. 6 ; x. 21 (Xen. C. 4, 5, 58), cf. Luke ii. 8 ; xii. 14, βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ τινα Luke i. 33 ; Rom. v. 14 ; cf. Malal. 5 p. 143.

c) of the heart's direction, the disposition, hence *towards* (Franke, Dem. 127), *erga* and *contra*, Matt. x. 21 ; Luke vi. 35 ; 2 Cor. x. 2 ; 364 Rom. ix. 23 (not 1 Pet. iii. 12), Sturz, ind. to Dio C. p. 151 ; hence ^{6th ed.} to trust, hope, *upon* Matt. xxvii. 43 ; 2 Cor. ii. 3 ; 1 Tim. v. 5 ; 1 Pet. i. 13, but also σπλαγχνίζεσθαι ἐπὶ τινι, to have compassion *on* (towards) one, Matt. xv. 32 ; Mark viii. 2. d) of the direction of thought or discourse, Mark ix. 12 ; Heb. vii. 13 (Rom. iv. 9), or the will, and consequently of the intention and aim, Luke xxiii. 48 (Plat. Crit. 52 b.), Matt. iii. 7 (Xen. M. 2, 3, 13 ; Cŷr. 7, 2, 14 ; Fischer, ind. ad Palaeph. under ἐπι), Matt. xxvi. 50 ἐφ' ὃ (Plato, Gorg. 447 b.), also when aim and result coincide, Heb. xii. 10. Lastly, it is used in a very general sense : *in reference to*, as Matt. xxv. 40, 45 (as to Rom. xi. 13 see a)). On 428 πιστὸς ἐπὶ τι Matt. xxv. 21, see Fr. in loc.

§ 50. INTERCHANGE, ACCUMULATION, AND REPETITION OF PREPOSITIONS.

382

7th ed.

1. The same preposition is employed in the same sentence or in parallel passages (especially of the first three Evangelists) with different cases to denote different relations ; as, Heb. ii. 10 δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, Rev. v. 1 ; xi. 10 ; xiv. 6 ; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 9, 12 οὐκ ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, — ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναίκος, Cf. Demosth. Philipp. 2 p. 25 c. To this more remotely may be referred Heb. xi. 29 διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς, where the Acc. is governed by the compound διαβαίνειν, after which, however, διὰ itself governs the Genitive (cf. Josh. xxiv. 17 οὓς παρήλθομεν δι' αὐτῶν, Wisd. x. 18). The distinction between such different cases, in itself delicate, sometimes almost wholly disappears in practice ; as, Matt. xix. 28 ὅταν καθίσθῃ . . . ἐπὶ θρόνον δοῦν αὐτοῦ, καθίσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, xxiv. 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, Mark xiii. 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ (cf. Josh. v. 15 in one and the same clause ἐφ' ᾧ νῦν ἔστηκα ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, Gen. xxxix. 5 ; xlix. 26 ; Exod. viii. 3 ; xii. 7 ; Jon. iv. 10), Rev. v. 1, 13 ; vi. 2, 16 ; vii. 1 ; xiii. 16. In the same way Greek authors employ ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους and ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων (Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 272) the one as often

as the other (Sept. even ἀναβαλνεν ἐπὶ ταῖς οἰκίαις Joel. ii. 9). In Rev. xiv. 9 we find λαμβάνει τὸ χάραγμα ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, xiii. 1. Cf. also Diog. L. 2, 77 . . . ἐπὶ τί ἤκου; ἔφη ἐπὶ τῷ μεταδώσειν etc., Pol. 6, 7, 2 τραφέντας ὑπὸ τοιούτοις, but 10, 25, 1 τραφεῖς καὶ παιδευθεῖς ὑπὸ Κλέανδρον. In general, see Jacobs, Anthol. III. 194, 286; Bhdy. 200 f. Such apparent indifference as respects case occurs most frequently with ἐπὶ (Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 74), cf. ἐλπίζεν ἐπὶ τινι and τινα 1 Tim. iv. 10; v. 5, πεποιθέναι ἐπὶ τινι and τινα 2 Cor. i. 9; ii. 3, καταστήσαι ἐπὶ τινος and τινι Luke xii. 42, 44 (κόπτεσθαι ἐπὶ τινα Rev. i. 7 and ἐπὶ τινι xviii. 9 var.), ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος Acts xii. 20 and ὁ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἄρκυσι Xen. Cyr. 2, 4, 25; see Lob. Phryn. 474 sq.

429 Moreover, see as to ἐπὶ used of aim with Gen. Bremi, Aesch. p. 412, with Dat. and Acc. Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 59, as to ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ and ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ Schoem. Isaac. p. 349, as to παρά with Gen. instead of

365 Dat. Schaef. Dion. p. 118 sq. Hence in detached instances, where
 6th ed. an exact parallel may not be found in Greek authors (Luke i. 59 καλεῖν ἐπὶ τινι cf. Ezra ii. 61; Neh. vii. 63 etc.), we are not authorized to pronounce the construction un-Greek, particularly if something analogous can be adduced (Mtth. 1374), or if the case employed can be easily conceived as connected with the preposition in question. On the other hand, the N. T. writers never use ἐπὶ Κλαυδίῳ or Κλαύδιον for ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου, nor construe ἐπὶ of condition (stipulation) with the Gen. or Acc. It was not till a later period that different cases, which though construed with the

383 same preposition conveyed different significations, began to be
 7th ed. confounded in the written language of the Greeks, so that e.g. μετά with Gen. and μετά with Acc. came to be used in the same sense, see above, p. 363.

That in the same sentence the same preposition with the same case should be used in *different* relations and senses cannot be considered any more strange in Greek than in any other language, e.g. Luke xi. 50 ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν . . . ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἀβελ etc., Rom. xv. 13 εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου, Jno. ii. 23 ἦν ἐν τ. Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, 2 Cor. vii. 16 χαίρω ὅτι ἐν παντὶ θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν, xii. 12; 1 Cor. iii. 18; Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 3, 14; ii. 3, 7; iv. 22; vi. 18; Phil. i. 26; ii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4; Col. i. 29; ii. 2; iv. 2; Heb. v. 8; ix. 11 f.; Jno. iv. 45 (xvii. 15); Acts xvii. 31; 2 Pet. i. 4 (Philostr. her. 4, 1; Arrian. Epict. 4, 13, 1).

2. The two different prepositions in the same sentence in Philem.

5 ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν, ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους are usually explained by referring, in regard to the sense, the words πρὸς τὸν κύριον to πίστιν, and εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους to ἀγάπην; — a *chiasmus* in which there would be nothing inherently surprising, cf. Plat. legg. 9, 868 b. (see Ast, animadv. p. 16), Horat. Serm. 1, 3, 51 and the expositors in loc. It is simpler, however, to take πίστις in the sense of *fidelity*, and to let both πρὸς τ. κ. and εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους depend upon it alike, without making any distinction between the prepositions; see Meyer. Though some Codd. give εἰς in the former 430 clause, this is only a correction, occasioned by the endeavor to make the phraseology uniform and by the circumstance that elsewhere faith in Christ is always called πίστις ἢ εἰς Χριστόν. Yet the expression πίστιν ἔχειν πρὸς τινα is quite unobjectionable, and occurs at least in Epiphan. Opp. II. 335 d. As to Luke v. 15; Jno. vii. 42; 2 Cor. x. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 3; Rom. iv. 18; x. 17; Eph. iv. 12; 1 Jno. iii. 24; 1 Thess. iv. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 12, no remark is required. On 1 Cor. iv. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 17; iii. 5; xiii. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 8 see the more recent expositors. On the other hand, in 1 Thess. ii. 6 οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, οὔτε ἀφ' ἑμῶν οὔτε ἀπ' ἄλλων the two prepositions are quite synonymous, as also in Jno. xi. 1; Acts xxiii. 34. In Rom. iii. 30 Paul certainly does not have in view any difference of meaning (between ἐκ πίστεως and διὰ τῆς πίστεως), as doctrinally considered πίστις may with equal propriety be conceived of either as the source or as the means of blessedness (Gal. iii. 8; Eph. ii. 8). Cf. from Greek authors Paus. 7, 7, 1 αἱ ἐκ πολέμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς νόσου συμφοραί, Isocr. permut. 738; Arrian. Al. 2, 18, 9; Diod. S. 5, 30; Schaef. Gnom. p. 203 366 and Soph. I. 248; Bornem. Xen. Mem. p. 45. As little difference 6th ed. is there between the two prepositions in 2 Jno. 2 τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῶν καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται, and in Exod. vi. 4 ἐν ᾗ (γῇ) καὶ παρώκησαν ἐπ' αὐτῆς, Jon. iv. 10. Lastly, in 2 Cor. iii. 11 the distinction urged by Billroth between διὰ δόξης and ἐν δόξῃ will 384 hardly stand the test of usage, see above, p. 386. As to διὰ of 7th ed. condition (state), see p. 379 sq. On the other hand, the difference of import between κατὰ and ἐπὶ in 1 Cor. xi. 4, 10 and between ἐκ and διὰ in 1 Pet. i. 23 is manifest.

3. Prepositions of kindred signification are substituted for each other in parallel passages in the Gospels and elsewhere; as, Matt. xxvi. 28 (Mark xiv. 24) αἷμα τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, on the contrary, Luke xxii. 20 τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλ. ἐκχ.; Matt. vii. 16 μήτι

συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὴν, on the contrary, Luke vi. 44 οὐκ ἐξ ἀκανθ. συλλέγουσι σύκα; Matt. xxiv. 16 φευγέτωσαν ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη (*up to*) cf. Palaeph. 1, 10, but Mark xiii. 14 φευγ. εἰς τὰ ὄρη (*into*); Jno. x. 32 διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον λιθάζετέ με; vs. 33 περὶ καλοῦ ἔργου οὐ λιθάζομέν σε; Heb. vii. 2 ὃ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ, vs. 4 ὃ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβρ. ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων; Rom. iii. 25 εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, on the contrary, vs. 26 πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τ. δικ. αὐτοῦ. Cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 43 πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ τεῖχος προσήγαγον . . . οὐκ ἐθέλω ὑπ' αὐτὰ τὰ τεῖχη ἄγειν. Here belongs also Heb. xi. 2 ἐν ταύτῃ (τῇ πίστει) ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, vs. 39 πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως (through faith, i.e. ut instructi fide); here the phrases εὐχεσθαι, προσεῦχεσθαι, εὐχαριστεῖν, δέησις περὶ or ὑπέρ τινος (Rom. x. 1; 2 Cor. i. 11; Eph. vi. 18; Col. i. 3, 9; 1 Cor. i. 4; Eph. i. 16; cf. Acta apocr. p. 53); here too the expression *suffer* or *die* περὶ or ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν (the former signifying *on account of*, the latter *for*, sins) 1 Cor. xv. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18. Sometimes even the good Codd. vary between ὑπὲρ and περὶ, as in Gal. i. 4, as these prepositions were often interchanged by the transcribers. Cf. Weber, Dem. 129. (Recent editors have proposed, assuredly without sufficient reason, to correct the reading in Eurip. Alcest. 180, where οὐ θνήσκειν ἐπεί occurs instead of the elsewhere more usual ὑπὲρ, see Monk in loc.)

Sometimes we find in parallel phrases a preposition now inserted and now omitted; as, 1 Pet. iv. 1 παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί, and immediately afterwards ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκί, Luke iii. 16; Acts i. 5; xi. 16 βαπτίζεν ὕδατι, but βαπτ. ἐν ὕδατι Matt. iii. 11; Jno. i. 26, 33.¹ This difference in phraseology does not affect the sense, but each form of expression arose from a different conception: πάσχειν ἐν σαρκί means, *suffer in the flesh* (body); πάσχειν σαρκί means, *suffer according to* (as respects) *the flesh* (§ 31, 6). Βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι signifies, *baptize in water* (immersing); βαπτίζεν ὕδατι, *baptize with water*. Here, and in most other passages, the identity of the two expressions in *sense* is manifest;² yet we must not consider one as put for the other. Cf. besides, Eph. ii. 1 νεκροὶ τοῖς παρὰ πτώμασι but Col. ii. 13 νεκροὶ ἐν τοῖς παραπτ., 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾗ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν, Matt. vii. 2; cf. Luke vi. 38; 1 Jno. iii. 18.

4. It was formerly supposed (Glassii Philol. sacr. ed. Dathe

¹ But invariably only βαπτίζ. ἐν πνεύματι.

² So in Arist. anim. 4, 10, p. 111 Sylb. λαμβάνεσθαι τριδάοντι is, caught *with* a trident (like τῇ χειρὶ *with* the hand); but ληφθῆναι ἐν τῷ τριδάοντι, immediately following, is caught *on* the trident. Schneider and Bekker, however, read in the latter passage ληφθῆναι ἔν.

I. 412 sq.) that in the N. T. the prepositions *ἐν* and *εἰς* especially were used indiscriminately for each other (see also Sturz, Lexic. Xen. II. 68, 166). The former, it was said, was employed agreeably to the Hebrew idiom with verbs of motion or direction to denote *into*, as Matt. x. 16 *ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων*, Jno. v. 4 *ἄγγελος κατέβαιγεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ*, Luke vii. 17 *ἔξῃλθεν ὁ λόγος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ*, Mark v. 30 *ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἐπιστραφεῖς*, Rom. v. 5 *ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν*, Luke v. 16 ; Jno. viii. 37 ; 1 Cor. xi. 18, etc. (in Rev. xi. 11 the reading is very uncertain, and Mark i. 16 ; 1 Tim. iii. 16 do not come under this head). The latter, it was imagined, was used with verbs of rest to signify *in*, as Acts vii. 4 (*ἡ γῆ*) *εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε*, Mark ii. 1 *εἰς οἶκόν ἐστι*, Jno. i. 18 *ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς*, ix. 7 *νύφαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν* etc.¹

a. Now first in reference to *ἐν*: the Greeks also, particularly Homer, sometimes use *ἐν* with verbs of motion to indicate at the same time the result of the motion, that is, *rest*.² This they do from a love of terseness peculiar to the Greek race. It is only in later writers, however, that such use of *ἐν* appears in prose (for Thuc. 4, 42 ; 7, 17 ; Xen. H. 7, 5, 10 have now been emended on MS. authority, Mth. 1343), e.g. Aelian. 4, 18 *κατῆλθε Πλάτων ἐν Σικελίᾳ* i.e. *he came (and dwelt) in Sicily*, Paus. 6, 20, 4 *αὐτοὶ κομίσαι φασι τῆς Ἱπποδαμείας τὰ ὀστᾶ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ*, 7, 4, 3 etc.; Alciph. 2, 3, p. 227 Wagn.; Xen. Eph. 2, 12; Arrian. Epict. 1, 11, 32; Aesop. 16, 127, 343 de Fur.; Dio Cass. 1288, 23; cf. Heind. Plat. Soph. p. 427 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 178 sq.; Schaef. Demosth. III. p. 505. The same explanation applies likewise to Matt. x. 16; Rev. xi. 11,³ and perhaps also (with BCrus.) to Jno. 368 v. 4, especially if these words are a later addition; for the other ^{6th ed.}

¹ The above observation must be confined to the two cases specified; for when *ἐν* and *εἰς* might according to different conceptions be used with equal propriety, it could not be said that one is put for the other, e.g. *τοῦτο ἐγένετό μοι*, or *τοῦτο ἐγένετο εἰς ἐμέ*.

² The same remark applies to the Hebrew *ב* when it appears to be joined to verbs of motion, see my exeg. Studien I. 49 ff. Further, cf. *Krebs*, obs. 78 f. — *ἦκω ἐν* does not come under this head (Lucian. paras. 34; cf. *Poppo*, Thuc. III. II. 891). Neither can Perfects or Pluperfects with *ἐν*, as *καταπεφυγμένοι ἐν τόπῳ* Plat. Soph. 260 c.; Thuc. 4, 14, etc., be considered as parallel with the above examples. They show, however, the origin of this usage, cf. *Bhdy.* 208; and in good writers the usage is generally confined to such cases only, *Krū.* S. 286. Finally, the (not infrequent) construction *ἔρχεσθαι ἐν* Luke ix. 46; xxiii. 42; Rev. xi. 11, etc. is perhaps to be also excepted when it denotes *come (arise) in*.

³ The fact that *εἰσέρχεσθαι ἐν* appears to be an imitation of the Hebrew *ב* *נִכְנָח* makes no difference, as this Hebrew expression is undoubtedly to be explained in the same way.

exposition, *went down in the pool* (into the depths, to produce the 386 *παράχη*, see Lücke), is opposed by the consideration, that then in 7th ed. so circumstantial a narrative a descent of the angel from heaven 433 would first of all have been mentioned. In all other passages the substitution of *έν* for *εις* is merely apparent: Luke vii. 17 means *went forth (spread) in all Judea*; Mark v. 30 *ἐπιστραφεὶς έν τῷ ὄχλῳ* turned him about (turned around) in the crowd, Luke v. 16 *ἦν ὑποχωρῶν έν ταῖς ἐρήμοις* continued retired in the solitary places. If the reading is genuine in Matt. xiv. 3, *ἔθετο έν φυλακῇ* exactly corresponds to the Latin *ponere in loco* (for which we, according to a different but equally correct conception, say *put into*); similar is Jno. iii. 35 *πάντα δέδωκεν έν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ*, 2 Cor. viii. 16 (Iliad. 1, 441; 5, 574; cf. also Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 598). In the same way, Matt. xxvi. 23 *ὁ ἐμβάψας έν τῷ τρυβλίῳ* is, he that dippeth in the dish, an expression as correct as the German *in die Schüssel eintaucht*, dippeth into the dish (cf. Aesop. 124, 1). In 1 Cor. xi. 18 *συνερχ. έν ἐκκλησίᾳ* means, meet in an assembly (as we say, meet in the market-place, in company, etc.). In Phil. iv. 16 *ὅτι καὶ έν Θεσσαλονίκη ... εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν μου ἐπέμψατε* the expression is abbreviated: *ye sent to me* (when I was) in Thessalonica (cf. Thuc. 4, 27 and Poppo, in loc.). As to Jno. viii. 37 there may be doubt how *έν ὑμῖν* is to be taken, see Lücke; but there can be no doubt that *έν* is not put for *εις*. As to Jas. v. 5 see de Wette. In Matt. xxvii. 5 *έν τῷ ναῷ* is, in the temple. In Rom. v. 5 the use of the Perfect was sufficient to indicate the correct interpretation (cf. Poppo, Thuc. 4, 14).¹

b. More surprising still are the passages adduced in support of the assertion that *εις* is used for *έν*. Even in Greek authors *εις* is not unfrequently construed with verbs of rest; and then the idea of *motion* (preceding or accompanying) was originally included, agreeably to the principle of *breviloquentia* mentioned above (Heind. Plat. Protag. p. 467; Acta Monac. I. 64 sq.; II. 47; Schaeff. Demosth. I. 194 sq.; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis 162 sq.; Hm. Soph. Aj. 80; Jacobs, Ael. anim. p. 406, and, as to Latin, Hartung on the Cases S. 68 ff.), as Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 4 *νόμῳ εἰς τὰς ἐαυτῶν χώρας ἕκαστοι τούτων πάρειςιν*, Aelian. 7, 8 *Ἐφαιστίων εἰς Ἐκβάτανα ἀπέθανε*, Isaeus 5, 46 (cf. Acts xxi. 13),² Diod. S. 5, 84 *διατρίβων*

¹ Passages of Greek authors in which some have erroneously thought *έν* is put for *εις*, have been more correctly explained by Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 247. As to *εις* for *έν*, see *ibid.* II. 91. As to Latin phrases in which *in* with Ablat. appeared to be used for *in* with Acc., see Krütz, Sallust. II. 31 sq.

² *Εἰς χωρίον τῆς Ἀρκადίας θνήσκει* Steph. Byz. p. 495 Mein. is to be explained in a different manner.

εἰς τὰς νήσους Paus. 7, 4, 3. (The use of εἰς with such verbs as 434
 ἵζειν, καθέζεσθαι — καθῆσθαι — Mark xiii. 3, cf. Eurip. Iph. T. 620,
 is of a somewhat different nature, see Bttm. Dem. Mid. p. 175 ; 369
 Schweigh. Lexic. Herod. I. p. 282 ; Valcken. Herod. 8, 71 etc. ; 6th ed.
 Poppo, Thuc. III. I. p. 659 ; Fr. Mr. p. 558.) In this way are to 387
 be explained the following passages : Mark ii. 1, where we say in 1st ed.
 German also *er ist ins Haus*, i.e. he has gone into the house and
 is now there (Her. 1, 21 ; Arrian. Al. 4, 22, 3 ; Paus. 8, 10, 4 and
 Siebelis in loc. ; Liv. 37, 18 ? Curt. 3, 5, 10 ; Vechner, hellenol.
 p. 258 sq.) cf. xiii. 16 ; Luke xi. 7 ; Acts viii. 40 Φίλιππος εὗρέθη
 εἰς Ἀζωτον Philip was found conducted to Azotus (cf. vs. 39 πνεῦμα
 κυρίου ἤρπασε τὸν Φίλ., see Wesseling. Diod. Sic. II. 581 ; cf.
 Esth. i. 5 ; Evang. apocr. p. 447) ; Acts vii. 4 εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν
 κατοικεῖτε (Xen. A. 1, 2, 24 ; Xen. Eph. 2, 12 ; Theodoret. Opp.
 I. 594), Mark x. 10 (where the position of the words is to be
 noted) ; probably also Acts xviii. 21 δεῖ με τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην
 ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσ., but the genuineness of these words is suspected
 and the more recent editors have omitted them, [they are wanting,
 too, in Cod. Sin.] ; Jno. xx. 7 ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἓνα τόπον *wrapt*
together (and put) *into one place*. On the other hand, in Acts
 xii. 19 εἰς Καισάρειαν belongs grammatically to κατελθών. In Acts
 xx. 14 εἰς signifies *to*. In Acts xix. 22 ἔπεσχε χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν,
 probably εἰς is not used simply in a local sense : *he remained in*
Asia ; but, *he remained for Asia*, in order to labor there longer.
 The only admissible interpretation of Acts iv. 5 συναχθῆναι αὐτῶν
 τοὺς ἀρχοντας . . . εἰς Ἱεροσ. is that of Beza ; yet the good Codd.
 [Sin. excepted] give ἐν. In Acts ii. 39 the οἱ εἰς μακράν are those
 dwelling *at a distance*, — *afar off*. In Jno. i. 18 ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν
 κόλπον (though here said in reference to God) is probably to be
 referred to the primary (external and local) import : who is
 (laid) *upon* (unto) *the bosom*.¹ In Jno. ix. 7 εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν
 is as respects sense to be connected also with ὑπαγε, cf. vs. 11 : *go*
into the pool and wash thyself (cf. Luke xxi. 37) see Lücke, though
 νίπτεσθαι εἰς ὕδωρ by itself is as correct as in Cato R. R. 156, 5
 in *aquam macerare*, or *sich in ein Becken waschen* (Arrian. Epict. 435

¹ Cf. with this as analogous in *aurem, oculum dormire* Terent. Heaut. 2, 2, 101 ; Plin. epp. 4, 29 ; Plaut. Pseud. 1, 1, 121. De Wette rejects the above explanation, "as here at least quite inadmissible." But why should not such figurative expressions, transferred from human relations to God, be taken in the sense which primarily belongs to them, the sense in which they had their origin ? The phrase is in existence ; when transferred to immaterial relations it is taken just as it stands, without further thought respecting the physical relation in which it originated.

ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι points to εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον; accordingly, he reconciles to God ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι those κτισθέντας εἰς ἓνα ἄνθρ. In Rom. i. 24 εἰς ἀκαθαρσ. is to be joined directly to παρέδωκεν, and ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθ. is *in their lusts*, cf. vs. 27 ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν. In 1 Cor. i. 8 ἐν τῇ ἡμ. is construed with ἀνεγκλήτους, and this is in apposition to ὑμᾶς. In the same way, in 1 Thess. iii. 13, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ, which is parallel to ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ, depends directly on ἀμέμπτους. In 2 Thess. ii. 13 εἴλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος etc. means, *chosen to salvation in sanctification of the Spirit*; ἁγιασμ. πν. is the spiritual state in which the *being chosen to salvation* is realized. 1 Jno. iv. 9 is simply: *in this was manifested the love of God on (as respects) us*. On the other hand, in Rom. ii. 5 θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς is an abbreviated expression: *thou art treasuring up to thyself wrath (which will break forth) on the day of wrath*. And 1 Thess. iv. 7 οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀλλὰ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ is put for ὥστε εἶναι (ἡμᾶς) ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. 1 Cor. vii. 15 and Eph. iv. 4 may also be explained in the same way; others, however, understand ἐν to refer to the ethical nature of the κλήσις, see, especially, Harless on the latter passage. Moreover, in 1 Cor. the Perfect is not to be overlooked. As to διδόναι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις 2 Cor. i. 22 and the like (Rom. v. 5) no remark is necessary after what has been said above, p. 414. Finally, εἰς is not put for ἐν in Rom. vi. 22 ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν; the εἰς manifestly designates the moral goal. Similar is Rom. xiii. 14. In Eph. iii. 16 κραταιοῦσθαι εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον means, *to become strong in regard to the inward man*. In general, it is inherently improbable that in clearly conceived doctrinal statements the apostles should have perplexed the reader by employing ἐν for εἰς or εἰς for ἐν. At least, they could have written εἰς with as much ease, certainly, as the expositors who are trying to smuggle it in.

The alleged usage of indiscriminately interchanging these prepositions is not sustained by an appeal to Suidas and the Fathers;¹ nor by the fact that sometimes in parallel passages εἰς and ἐν exchange places, as Matt. xxi. 8 ἵστρωσαν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, but Mark xi. 8 εἰς τὴν ὁδόν; Matt. xxiv. 18 ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μὴ ἐπιστρέψατω, Mark xiii. 16 ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν etc.; Mark i. 16 ἀμφιβάλλοντες ἀμφίβληστον ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, Matt. iv. 18 βαλλ.

¹ The words of 2 Cor. xii. 2 ἀπαγόντα ζωὴς τρίτου οὐρανοῦ are quoted by Clem. Alex. paedag. I. p. 44 Sylb. thus: ἐν τρίτῃ ἀπασθεὶς οὐρανῷ; on the other hand, those of Prov. xvii. 3 δοκιμάζεται ἐν καινῷ ἔργῳ etc. are quoted by him in Strom. II. p. 172 as follows: δοκιμ. . . . εἰς κέμινον.

ἀμφίβλ. εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν — the former means, *they cast the net about* (waved it about) *in the sea*; the latter, *they cast it into the sea*; different stages and acts of their business are indicated. In Rom. v. 21 ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ *in death*, which is actually present; but ἵνα ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον *unto life*, as the end to be attained; probably, however, εἰς ζ. αἰών. depends directly on δικ. see Fr.; cf. besides 2 Cor. xiii. 3. It must, however, be admitted that the limitation according to which εἰς is construed with verbs of rest and ἐν on the other hand with verbs of motion, is overlooked by writers of the later period, especially by the Scholiasts¹ and Byzantines, and so ἐν and εἰς are employed without distinction, and ἐν even begins to predominate with verbs of motion, see Leo Diac. ed. Hase p. XII.; Blume, Lycurg. p. 56; Niebuhr, ind. to Agath., also the indices to Theophan. and to Menandri hist. in the Bonn ed.² The modern Greeks, in fact, have retained but one of these prepositions. Cf. further, Argum. ad Demosth. Androt. § 17; Theodoret. Opp. II. 466, 804; III. 869; Epiphan. haer. 46, 5; Pseudepiph. vit. proph. pp. 241, 248, 332, 334, 340, 341; Basilic. I. 150; III. 496, also the Sept. 390 the Apocr. and the Pseudepigr.³ in many passages. Yet in the N. T. 7th ed. there is at least no instance more anomalous than those which occur in the earlier writers of the κοινή.

372 6. It is especially characteristic of Paul to use several preposi-
 6th ed tions referring to one and the same substantive, in order that
 together they may define his idea on all sides, e.g. Gal. i. 1 Παῦλος
 ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ
 Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς etc. i.e. an apostle sent forth in no respect
 by human authority (not *from* men, as the ultimate authority;
 not *through* any man, as intermediate authority); Rom. iii. 22
 (πεφανέρωται) δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς
 πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας, i.e. is most completely imparted to all be-
 lievers (is manifested *unto* all and *over* (upon) all), Syriac ܕܠܟܠܝܢ
 ܕܠܟܠܝܢ (Bengel in loc. is arbitrary, following the ancient
 expositors; Rück. helpless); xi. 36 ἐξ αὐτοῦ (θεοῦ) καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ
 καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, i.e. the world bears every possible depend-
 ent relation to God, — it is *from* (out of) him, inasmuch as he
 438 created it (the First Cause); *through* him, inasmuch as he is

¹ Compare Hm. on Böckh's Behndl. d. Inschrift. S. 181 f.

² Niceph. Constant. p. 48 τυφλώσας ἐν τῇ ῥάμῃ ἐξέπεμψε, Theophan. p. 105 Γρηγόριος παθησιαστικώτερον εἰδίδασκεν . . . εἰς τὸ εὐκτήριον τῆς ἁγίας ἀναστάσεως, p. 62, 65, 68; Malal. 18, 467.

³ Cf. Wahl, Clav. apocr. pp. 165, 195; Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 598, 629; Brtschn. lexic. man. p. 139; Acta apocr. pp. 5, 13, 38, 65, 66, 68, 71, 88, 91, 93, 94, 263, and on almost every page.

(perpetually) efficient upon it; *to* him, inasmuch as he is the ultimate End to which all things are directed;¹ Col. i. 16 ἐν αὐτῷ (Χριστῷ) ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα . . . τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται, i.e. the universe stands in necessary and complete relation to Christ; first, historically (Aor.): *in* him was the world created, inasmuch as he, the divine λόγος, was the personal ground of the divine creative act (just as *in* Christ God redeemed the world); then of the world as subsisting (Perf.): all things have been created *through* (by) him (as mediate person), and *to* (for) him (as κύριος πάντων in the most comprehensive sense); in vs. 17 πρὸ πάντων refers back to δι' αὐτοῦ, and ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν is explanatory of εἰς αὐτόν. Eph. iv. 6 εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἡμῖν, i.e. God is the God and Father of all in every conceivable relation, (ruling) *over* all, (working) *through* all, (dwelling) *in* all (filling them with his Spirit). 2 Pet. iii. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ θεοῦ λόγῳ *out of* water (as the material in which it lay contained) and *through* water, i.e. through the action of the water, which partly retired to the low places, and partly formed the clouds in the sky. In the parallel clauses in 1 Cor. xii. 8f. spiritual gifts are referred, by the use of διὰ, κατὰ, ἐν, to the πνεῦμα from which they all originate: διὰ designates the Spirit as mediate agent; κατὰ, as disposer (vs. 11); ἐν, as container. The antithesis between ἐκ (or ἀπό) and εἰς (the point *from* and the point *towards*) is easily perceived, Rom. i. 17; 2 Cor. iii. 18 (cf. in a local reference Matt. xxiii. 34). (In 1 Cor. viii. 6, where the corresponding prepositions refer to different subjects — θεὸς ἐξ οὗ and κύρ. 'Ι. Χρ. δι' οὗ — there cannot be a moment's doubt respecting the propriety and import of the prepositions.)

The following instances in Greek authors deserve notice as parallel: 373 Mr. Anton. 4, 23 ἐκ σοῦ (ὦ φύσις) πάντα, ἐν σοὶ πάντα, εἰς σέ πάντα, Heliod. 2, 25 πρὸ πάντων καὶ ἐπὶ πάσῃ, Philostr. Apoll. 3, 25 τοὺς ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ τε καὶ ἐν θαλάττῃ, Isocr. big. p. 846 τὰ μὲν ὑφ' ἡμῶν, τὰ δὲ μεθ' ἡμῶν, τὰ δὲ δι' ἡμᾶς, τὰ δ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, Acta Ignat. p. 368 δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ τῷ πατρὶ ἡ δόξα. Other instances may be seen in Wetst. II. 77 and Fr. Rom. II. 556.

7. When two or more substantives dependent on the same preposition immediately follow one another joined together by a copula,

¹ Theodoret has thus explained the passage: αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν, αὐτὸς τὰ γεγονότα διατελεῖ κυβερνῶν . . . εἰς αὐτὸν ἀφορᾷ ἅπαντας προσήκει ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν ὑπαρξάντων χάριν ὁμολογούντας, αἰτοῦντας δὲ τὴν ἔπειτα προμήθειαν, αὐτῷ δὲ χρῆ καὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀναπέμπειν βοήθειαν.

the preposition is most naturally repeated, if the substantives in question denote things which are to be conceived as distinct and independent, Weber, Demosth. p. 189 (as to Latin, see Kritze, Sallust. I. 226; Zumpt, Gr. S. 601 f.); but not repeated, if the substantives fall under a single category, or (if proper names) under one common class:

a. Luke xxiv. 27 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν (Acts xv. 4); 1 Thess. i. 5 ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ὡγίῳ καὶ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ, Jno. xx. 2;¹ 2 Tim. iii. 11; Acts xxviii. 2; Mark vi. 4; x. 29; xii. 33; Rev. vi. 9. Hence it is almost always repeated when two nouns are connected together by καὶ . . . καὶ (Bremi, Lys. p. 3 sq.) or τε . . . καί, as in Acts xxvi. 29 καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ (the two are incompatible with each other), Luke xxii. 33; 1 Cor. ii. 3; Philem. 16; Acts xvii. 9; cf. Xen. Hier. 1, 5 (but Soph. Trach. 379); Phil. i. 7 ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ, Acts xxv. 23 etc. (cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 16; Thuc. 8, 97; Diod. S. 19, 86; 20, 15; Paus. 4, 8, 2).²

b. Jno. iv. 23 ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (two aspects of one comprehensive notion) see Lücke, Luke xxi. 26 ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων (essentially one state of mind), Eph. i. 21; 1 Thess. i. 8; Acts xvi. 2; xvii. 15 (cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 7; Arist. Eth. Nic. 7, 11 in.; Thuc. 3, 72; 2, 83; Paus. 10, 20, 2), also when the substantives are connected by τε . . . καί, as in Acts xxviii. 23 ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, i. 8; xxvi. 20 (Franke, Demosth. p. 65), Paus. 10, 37, 2; 25, 28; Xen. Hell. 1, 1, 3; Herod. 6, 3, 2. For instances with proper names, see Acts vi. 9 τῶν ἀπὸ 392 Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας, xiv. 21 ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Δύστρον καὶ Ἰκόν 7th ed. νιον καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν, xvi. 2; ix. 31; Matt. iv. 25.

If the substantives are connected *disjunctively* or *antithetically*, the preposition is in the former case usually, and in the latter always, repeated, Col. iii. 17 ὃ τι ἐὰν ποιῇτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, ii. 16; Matt. vii. 16; xvii. 25; Luke xx. 4; Jno. vii. 48; Acts iv. 7; viii. 34; Rom. iv. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 3, 21; xiv. 6; Rev. xiii. 16; cf. Paus. 7, 10, 1 (the contrary only in Heb. x. 28 ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν, 1 Tim. v. 19); Rom. iv. 10 οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν 440 ἀκροβυστίᾳ, vi. 15; viii. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 5; xi. 17; 2 Cor. i. 12; iii. 3;

¹ On this passage Bengel remarks: ex praeapos. repetita colligi potest, non una fuisse utrumque discipulum.

² As to the various cases in which Greek prose writers repeat a preposition after τε καὶ, see Sommer in the Jahrb. f. Philol. 1831. S. 408 f.; cf. Stallb. Phileb. p. 156; Weber, Dem. 189.

Eph. i. 21; vi. 12; Jno. vii. 22; xvii. 9, etc. (Alciph. 1, 31).¹ 374
 Lastly, in comparisons the preposition is always repeated, Acts 6th ed
 xi. 18; Rom. v. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 2; Heb. iv. 10
 (as to Greek authors, see Schaef. Julian. p. 19 sq.; Held, Plut.
 Aem. 124; Krü. 284). In general, there is a greater tendency
 to repeat the preposition in the N. T. than in Greek prose (Bhdy.
 201; Krüg. 284 f.; Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 229), which
 frequently or usually omits the preposition, not only before a noun
 simply connected with one preceding (Bornem. Xen. conv. 159),
 but also after *ἀλλά* or *ἥ* (Schaef. Dem. V. 569, 760; Plutarch.
 IV. 291; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 493; Weber, Dem. 389; Franke,
 Dem. 6) before words in apposition (Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 112,
 247; cf. Bornem. Schol. p. 173) and in answers (Stallb. Plat.
 sympos. p. 104 sq.; Gorg. p. 38; rep. I. 237). On the other hand,
 the following passages are singular even in the N. T.: Acts xxvi.
 18 *ἐπιστρέφει ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐπὶ*
τὸν θεόν, vii. 38; 1 Cor. x. 28; Heb. vii. 27, but cf. Aristot. Eth.
 Nicom. 10, 9, 1 *περί τε τούτων καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν*, *ἔτι δὲ καὶ φιλίας* etc.
 (see Zell, Aristot. Eth. p. 442); Lysias 1, in Theomnest. 7; Dion.
 H. IV. 2223, 1; Diog. L. prooem. 6; Strabo 16, 778; Diod. Sic.
 5, 31; Plutarch. Sol. c. 3.

In Jude 1 *ἐν* is not to be repeated from the preceding clause before
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as that would be harsh; but *Ἰησ. Χρ.* is the *dativus commodi*:
kept for Christ. Before a noun in apposition the preposition is regularly
 not repeated, Luke xxiii. 51; Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 4; it is only in cases
 of exegetical apposition that the repetition can take place, Rom. ii. 28
ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ περιτομή, Jno. xi. 54, (in 1 Jno. v. 20 there is
 no apposition). So also in the classics, though usually only when the
 word in apposition is separated from the principal substantive, Fritzsche,
quaest. Lucian. p. 127; Mith. 1402.

The repetition of the preposition before each of a series of nouns suc-
 ceeding one another without connectives, as in Eph. vi. 12 *ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς*
ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας... πρὸς τὰ πνεύμ.
etc., Jno. xvi. 8 (cf. Arist. rhet. 2, 10, 2), is of a rhetorical nature or
 serves to give greater prominence to the several particulars, see Dissen, 393
 Pind. p. 519. 7th ed.

The preposition with which the antecedent is construed, is usually in
 Greek authors not repeated before the relative, as Plat. legg. 10, 909 d.
ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς ἂν ὁ πατήρ αὐτῶν ὄφλη τὴν δίκην, 12, 955 b. *ἐν ἱεροῖς* — 441
οἷς ἂν ἐθέλῃ, 2, 659 b. *ἐκ ταύτου στόματος, οὕπερ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπεκαλέσατο* etc.

¹ But in such antitheses the preposition is not repeated before an adjective, as 1 Pet.
 i. 23 *οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου*.

Plat. Phaed. 21; Gorg. 453 e.; Lach. 192 b.; Thuc. 1, 28; Xen. conv 4, 1; An. 5, 7, 17; Hiero 1, 11; Aristot. probl. 26, 4 and 16; Paus. 9, 39, 4; cf. Bremi, Lys. p. 201; Schaef. Soph. III. 317; Dion. comp. p. 325; Melet. p. 124; Demosth. II. 200; Heller, Soph. Oed. C. p. 420; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 108; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 93; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 291; Bhdy. 203 f.
 875 So, in the N. T., Acts xiii. 39 ἀπὸ πάντων, ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε . . . δικαιοῦνται, Luke
 8th ed. δικαιοῦνται, xiii. 2 ἀφορίσατε . . . εἰς τὸ ἔργον, δ προσκέκλημαι αὐτοῦς, Luke i. 25; xii. 46; Matt. xxiv. 50; Rev. ii. 13 (not 1 Cor. vii. 20); on the contrary, Jno. iv. 53 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἐν ᾗ εἶπεν, Acts vii. 4; xx. 18 (Jon. iv. 10) cf. Demosth. Timoth. 705 b. ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις, ἐν οἷς γέγραπται τὴν τιμὴν τῶν φιαλῶν ὀφείλων, Aristot. anim. 5, 30; Plat. Soph. 257 d.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 4; Diog. L. 8, 68; Heinich. Euseb. II. 252. As to the Lat. see Ramshorn S. 378; Beier, Cic. offic. I. 123. The Greek authors, also, readily repeat the preposition when the relative is separated by several words from the antecedent, Her. 1, 47; Xen. vectig. 4, 13; Lucian. necyom. 9; Dio Chr. 17, 247.

In Greek authors, and especially in the poets, a preposition belonging to two successive nouns is sometimes, as is well known, expressed only once and that before the second noun, Hm. Vig. p. 854; Lob. Soph. Aj. v. 397 sq., the comment. on Anacr. 9, 22; Kühner II. 320 etc. Such an instance has been supposed to occur in Phil. ii. 22 (Heinich. Euseb. II. 252) ὅτι, ὡς πατρὶ τέκνον, σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν etc. But the passage contains rather a variatio structurae. Paul uses σὺν ἐμοί, bethinking himself that he cannot well say ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν: he has, as a child serves his father, served *with me*, etc. See, in general, the opposite remarks of Bhdy. p. 202; cf. however, Franke, Dem. p. 30.

Note 1. It is a peculiarity of later Greek, in particular, to combine a preposition with an adverb, especially of place or time (Krü. 266 f.), — either so as to make the preposition modify the meaning of the adverb, as in ἀπὸ πρῶτ Acts xxviii. 23, ἀπὸ πέρυσι 2 Cor. viii. 10; ix. 2, ἀπ' ἄρτι Matt. xxvi. 29, ἀπὸ τότε Matt. iv. 17 [xvi. 21] xxvi. 16 [Luke xvi. 16], ἔκπαλαι 2 Pet. ii. 3, ὑπερλίαν 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11 (cf. ὑπέρευ Xen. Hiero 6, 9); or so as to blend with an expressive adverb a preposition that seemed weakened by diversified usage (cf. in German: *oben auf dem Dache*), as ὑποκάτω, ὑπεράνω, κατέναντι. Sometimes also an adverb is strengthened by the preposition, as παραντίκα. To this class belong likewise such numerals as ἐφάπαξ Rom. vi. 10 etc. (Dio Cass. 1091, 91; 1156, 13, analogous to ἐςάπαξ Franke, Demosth. p. 30, πρὸς ἀπαξ Malal. 7, p. 178), ἐπὶ τρίς 304 Acts x. 16; xi. 10 (among the examples adduced by Kypke II. 48 is the 7th ed. analogous εἰς τρίς, which occurs in Her. 1, 86; Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 4; cf. Hm. Vig. p. 857). Many of these compounds are to be found only in writers 442 that flourished after the time of Alexander,¹ some only in Scholiasts, Lob.

¹ Yet ἐς ἀεί, ἐς ἔπειτα, ἐς ὀψέ, and the like, occur even in Thuc. 1, 129, 130; 4, 63; 8, 23. As to ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, and the like, see § 65, 2, p. 603.

Phryn. p. 46 sqq.; cf., however, Kühner II. 315; several, such as ἀπὸ πέρους (for which προπέρους or ἐκπέρους), are not to be met with even there. Further, cf. Sept. ἀπὸ ὀπισθεν (מֵאַחֲרַי) 1 Sam. xii. 20 and Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 25. (Consistency in the mode of writing these compounds, whether connected Krü. 266 or separated, has not been observed even by the most recent editors of the N. T.)

Note 2. The antique usage of employing (simple) prepositions without a case for *adverbs*, has been retained, with certain restrictions, in the prose style of all periods, Bhdv. 196. In the N. T. we find but a single example of this: 2 Cor. xi. 23 διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσίν; — ἡπὲρ ἐγώ *I more*. The instances which Kypke adduces in loc. are not all similar. Usually in prose such prepositions are supported by a δέ or γέ (μετὰ δέ is especially frequent) Bhdv. 198. Πρὸς in *addition, besides*, may be best compared with the above passage, e.g. Dem. 1 Aphob. 556a.; Franke, Demosth. p. 94. The form εἰ with the accent thrown back for ἐνί (ἐν), including the substantive verb, occurs several times, see p. 80; Bornem. (Stud. u. Krit. 1843. S. 108 f.) attempted, but on insufficient grounds, to introduce ἄπο *far from* (Bttm. II. 378) in Matt. xxiv. 1.

§ 51. USE OF PREPOSITIONS IN CIRCUMLOCUTIONS.

1. When a preposition with a noun forms a circumlocution for an adverb or (mostly with the aid of the article) for an adjective, the propriety of such a use of the preposition must be shown by a reference to its fundamental signification;¹ a merely empirical treatment might lead to erroneous conclusions. Note, then,

a. Ἀπό; e.g. ἀπὸ μέρους Rom. xi. 25; 2 Cor. i. 14 *in part* (from a part *hitherwards*), ἀπὸ μιᾶς (γνώμης) Luke xiv. 18 *unanimously* (proceeding *from one* determination), with one mind.

b. Διὰ with the Genitive usually denotes a mental state viewed as something mediate, a means: in Heb. xii. 1 δι' ὑπομονῆς may 443 be rendered, with (*through*) patience, *patiently*, assidue (similarly Rom. viii. 25 δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα etc., cf. δι' ἀφροσύνης *imprudenter* Xen. C. 3, 1, 18, δι' εὐλαβείας *timide* Dion. H. III. 395 1360, see Pflugk, Eur. Hel. p. 41), cf. also e.g. δι' ἀσφαλείας Thuc. 74 1, 17. Of a different nature is Heb. xiii. 22 διὰ βραχείων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν *breviter* — properly *by means of few* (words), paucis — cf. διὰ βραχυτάτων Dem. Pant. 624c., and below, § 64, 5. Used adjectively

¹ This is not altogether without difficulty, chiefly because in different languages different views of the same relation predominate, e.g. ἀπὸ μέρους *zum Theil*, *in part*, ἐκ δεξιῶν *zur Rechten*, *on, at, to the right*, ἀβ ὀριε *gegen Osten*, *on, to, towards the East*. Many phrases, too, arise from abbreviation.

2 Cor. iii. 11 εἰ τὸ καταργούμενον διὰ δόξης etc. (above, p. 379), it denotes a quality with which something is invested.

c. *Εἰς* expresses a degree (*unto*) which something reaches, Luke xiii. 11 εἰς τὸ παντελές *completely (perfectly) wholly* (Aelian. 7, 2, εἰς κάλλιστον Plat. Euthyd. 275 b., ἐς τὸ ἀκριβές Thuc. 6, 82); this, however, can hardly be called a periphrasis for the adverb.

d. *Ἐκ*, e.g. ἐκ μέρους 1 Cor. xii. 27 *ex parte (forth from a part)*. *Ἐκ* is used especially of the *standard* (*secundum*), as in ἐκ τῶν νόμων *secundum leges, legibus convenienter* (rule of conduct drawn as it were *out of the laws*); hence ἐξ ἰσότητος according to equality, 377 *equally* 2 Cor. viii. 13, ἐκ μέτρου *by measure, moderately* Jno. iii. 34; 44 d. cf. ἐξ ἀδίκου *injuste* Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 18, ἐξ ἴσου Her. 7, 135; Plato, rep. 8, 561 b., ἐκ προσηκόντων Thuc. 3, 67; see Ast, Plat. legg. p. 267; Bhdy. 230. It also denotes the source: ἐξ ἀνάγκης Heb. vii. 12; cf. Thuc. 3, 40; 7, 27; Dio C. 853, 93 (springing *out of necessity i.e. necessarily*); the same explanation applies to ἐκ συμφώνου 1 Cor. vii. 5 *ex composito*, which, however, under a different aspect (*in consequence of an agreement*), nearly comes under the first use. In the phrases οἱ ἐκ πίστεως Gal. iii. 7, οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς Acts x. 45, ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας Tit. ii. 8, οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας Rom. ii. 8, and the like, ἐκ designates party (dependence on), and consequently belonging to: *those of the faith*, who belong to the faith; who, as it were, side with faith. Cf. Polyb. 10, 16, 6; Thuc. 8, 92. A relation altogether material is expressed in Mark xi. 20 ἐκ ῥιζῶν (*out*) *from the roots, radicitus*. The temporal ἐκ τρίτου Matt. xxvi. 44 (1 Macc. ix. 1; Babr. 95, 97; 107, 16; Evang. apocr. p. 439; cf. ἐξ ὑστέρου Her. 1, 108) and the like (where the German, on the other hand, says *zum Dritten*) *for the third time*, is doubtless most simply, *out of the third*, (commencing) *from the third*; in later authors we find likewise ἐκ πρώτης Babr. 71, 2, ἐκ δευτέρας 114, 5.

444 e. *Ἐν*. Instances in which ἐν with a substantive may be taken adverbially, as ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ, ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xiv. 1; Col. iv. 5; Acts xvii. 31 (ἐν δίκῃ Plat. Crat. p. 419 d., ἐν τάχει Thuc. 1, 90),¹ need explanation the less, because we too can employ *in* with the corresponding substantive. The substantives usually denote abstract ideas, particularly qualities or dispositions in which one does something. The use of this preposition

¹ But in Jno. iv. 23, the words ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, dependent on προσκυνήσουσιν, must not be resolved and degraded into the adverbs πνευματικῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς; but ἐν denotes the sphere in which the προσκυνεῖν is exercised.

with a substantive for an adjective is equally plain, as ἔργα τὰ ἐν 396 δικαιοσύνῃ, τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ (ἐστὶ) 2 Cor. iii. 11, and the like. 7th ed.

2. f. Ἐπὶ is frequently construed with the Gen. of abstract nouns which denote either a quality *with* which a person acts in a given way (ἐπ' ἀδείας *with fearlessness*), or an objective notion with the actual existence of which something accords, as in Mark xii. 32 ἐπ' ἀληθείας *in accordance with truth, truly* (Dio C. 699, 65; 727, 82). With the Dat. ἐπὶ indicates, as it were, the ground *on* which something rests, Acts ii. 26 ἡ σύρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι *with, in* hope, confidence (in God); hence *securely, tranquilly*. The phrases ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἐφ' ὅσον, ἐπὶ πολὺ present no difficulty.

g. Κατά. The expression ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία 2 Cor. viii. 2 is probably to be rendered, *poverty extending to the lowest level*, the deepest poverty (cf. Strabo 9, 419); Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 5 is not parallel to this, ὁ κατὰ γῆς means: *terra conditus*. Probably the adverbial phrase καθ' ὅλου properly signifies *throughout* (in univ-
ersum), *in general*, as κατὰ with the Gen. has sometimes this meaning. The use of κατὰ with the Acc. of a substantive in circumlocutions for adverbs, as κατ' ἐξουσίαν, κατ' ἐξοχήν, κατὰ 378 γνῶσιν, requires no explanation, see Schaef. Long. p. 330 (cf. κατὰ 6th ed. τάχος Dio. C. 84, 40; 810, 93, κατὰ τὸ ἰσχυρόν Her. 1, 76, καθ' ὁρμήν Soph. Philoct. 562, κατὰ τὸ ἀνεπιστήμον Aeschin. dial. 3, 16, κατὰ τὸ ὀρθόν Her. 7, 143), see Bhdy. 241. As to ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόβεις Rom. ix. 11, οἱ κατὰ φύσιν κλάδοι xi. 21, see § 30, 3, note 5.

h. Πρὸς with the Acc., e.g. Jas. iv. 5 πρὸς φθόνον *invidiose*, cf. πρὸς ὀργήν Soph. El. 369 (properly, *according to envy, according to anger*); besides, πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν Sext. Emp. hypot. 1, 126 for ἀκριβῶς.

As to the use of the prepositions ἐκ, κατὰ etc. in circumlocutions for 445 certain cases, especially the Genitive, see § 30, 3, note 5 p. 192 sq.

§ 52. CONSTRUCTION OF VERBS COMPOUNDED WITH PREPOSITIONS.

1. Our attention here will naturally be confined to those compound verbs in which the preposition preserves its peculiar and independent force, and so directly governs a noun different from that governed by the transitive verb; as, ἐκβάλλειν *to cast out from*, ἀναφέρειν *to bring up upon*, etc. Accordingly, we do not speak

of those in which the signification of the preposition is either obscured (e.g. ἀποδέχσθαι, ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἀποθνήσκειν), or blended with that of the verb into *one* general idea (e.g. μεταδίδοναι *impart*, προάγειν τινά *praeire aliquem*, precede some one, ἀποδεκατοῦν τι *to tithe something*, συγκλείειν τι *enclose something*), or, approximating
 397 to the nature of an adverb, serves to give intensity to the verb (e.g.
 7th ed. ἐπιζητεῖν, διατελεῖν, διακαθαρίζειν, συντελεῖν, perpernare).

The full import of the compound verbs of the N. T., and how far they may be employed for simple verbs, has not yet been investigated thoroughly and on rational principles; cf., however, C. F. Fritzsche: Fischer's and Paulus's Observations on the precise Import of the Prepositions in Greek Compound Verbs, etc. Lips. 1809. 8vo.; Tittmann de vi praepositionum in verbis compos. in N. T. recte diiudicandis, Lips. 1814. 4to. (also in Synonym. N. T. I. 218 sqq.); J. v. Voorst de usu verbor. c. praepos. compositor. in N. T. Leid. 1818. 2 Spec. 8vo.; Theol. Annal. 1809. II. 474 ff. (Brunck, Aristoph. nub. 987; Zell, Aristotel. ethic. p. 383; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 154). Till very lately translators and expositors of the N. T. appeared to vie with each other in disregarding the exact import of compound verbs (cf. e.g. Seyffarth de indole ep. ad Hebr. p. 92). With a view to check such recklessness I have commenced a new inquiry into the subject: De verbor. c. praepos. compositor. in N. T. usu, Lips. 1834 ff. 4to.; hitherto five articles have appeared. (As to Greek authors in general, cf. Cattier, Gazophylac. sec. 10, p. 60 sqq. ed. Abresch; C. F.
 446 Hachenberg, de significat. praepositionum graec. in compositis. Traj. ad Rh. 1771. 8vo.)

379 2. Compound verbs in which the preposition retains its dis-
 6th ed. tinctive force may have one or another of the three following constructions:

a. The preposition may be repeated before the noun, as Matt. vii. 23 ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, Heb. iii. 16 οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, see Born. Xen. conv. p. 219 and my second Progr. de verb. comp. p. 7 sqq.; or

b. Another preposition of substantially the same import may be used before the noun, as Matt. xiv. 19 ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, Mark xv. 46 προσέκυλισε λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν; or

c. The compound verb may, without the intervention of a preposition, directly govern a case such as its import requires, and such at the same time as the preposition also commonly governs; as, Mark iii. 10 ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ, Luke xv. 2 συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς, etc. Accordingly, verbs compounded with ἀπό, κατά (against), πρὸ, take the Gen.; those compounded with περί (Matt. iv. 23 περιάγειν τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, Acts ix. 3), the Acc.

3. Which of these modes of construction is the regular one, must be learned from usage. Sometimes two of them, or all three together, occur (cf. ἐπιβάλλειν, likewise parallel passages such as Matt. xxvii. 60 and Mark xv. 46; Jno. ix. 6 and vs. 11; Acts xv. 20 and vs. 29).¹ Yet it must not be overlooked that even in this case usage has often established a distinction. Thus no one will regard it as an indifferent matter whether verbs compounded with εἰς be construed with a noun by the insertion of the preposition εἰς (πρός), or with a case alone without a preposition.² For instance, ἐκπίπτειν in its proper sense takes ἐκ; but when used figuratively (like spe excidere), it governs the Gen. (Gal. v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 17; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 36; yet see Diod. S. 17, 47).³ So προσφέρειν τινί of persons means, offerre alicui (aliquid); but προσφέρειν ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς to bring before the synagogue (authorities), Luke xii. 11.⁴ Cf. also προσέρχεσθαι τινι adire aliquem and προσέρχ. πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν 1 Pet. ii. 4; ἐφιστάναι τινί (of persons) Acts iv. 1, and ἐφιστάναι ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν xi. 11. See, in general, my second Progr. de verb. comp. p. 10 sqq.

4. The usage of the N. T. is more particularly as follows:

1) After verbs compounded with ἀπό,

a) for the most part ἀπό is repeated (cf., in general, Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. p. 225): so after ἀπέρχεσθαι (followed by a personal noun) Mark i. 42; Luke i. 38; ii. 15; Rev. xviii. 14 (Lucian. salt. 81), after ἀποπίπτειν Acts ix. 18 (in a material sense, cf. Her. 3, 130; Polyb. 11, 21, 3; in a figurative sense it does not occur in the N. T.), ἀφιστάναι desistere a, or to withdraw from a person, Acts v. 38; Luke ii. 37; xiii. 27; 2 Cor. xii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 5 etc. (Polyb. 1, 16, 3) but 1 Tim. iv. 1, see below, ἀπορροφᾶσθαι 1 Thess. ii. 17, ἀποσπᾶσθαι Luke xxii. 41; Acts xxi. 1 (Polyb. 1, 84, 1; Dion. H. judic. Thuc. 28, 5), after ἀφορίζειν Matt. xxv. 32, ἀποβαίνειν Luke v. 2 (Polyb. 23, 11. 4, etc.), ἀποχωρεῖν Matt. vii. 23; Luke ix. 39, ἀφαιρεῖσθαι Luke x. 42; xvi. 3 (Lucian. Tim. 45), ἀπαίρεσθαι Matt. ix. 15, ἀπαλλάττεσθαι Luke xii. 58;

¹ So ἀποστήναι deficere with ἀπὸ in Xen. C. 5, 4, 1 and with the Gen. alone in 4, 5, 11.

² In prose εἰσέναι or εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς is usually employed in a local sense, e.g. εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν; but with τινά or τινί (like incessere aliquem) in reference to desires, thoughts, etc. Demosth. Aristocr. 446 b.; Herod. 8, 8, 4, etc. Yet see Valck. Eurip. Phoen. 1099. As to εἰσέρχεσθαι in particular, see my second Progr. de verb. comp. p. 11 sq.

³ In Greek authors ἀπέχεσθαι abstinere usually takes the Gen.; but in the N. T. it is sometimes followed by ἀπό, Acts xv. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 3; v. 22.

⁴ Cf. πρὸς τοῖς ἰστοῖς τροχιλαῖς προσήρτηντο Polyb. 8, 6, 5; 3, 46, 8, but (fig.) 9, 20, 5 προσαρτῶν πολλά τινα τῇ στρατηγίᾳ.

Acts xix. 12, ἀποκρύπτειν Matt. xi. 25, ἐποστρέφειν Rom. xi. 26 Sept., once also after the figurative ἀποθνήσκειν Col. ii. 20 (cf. Porphy. abstin. 1, 41), which elsewhere, in the composite sense of *dying to*, is construed with the Dat. (see immediately below).

b) after ἀπολαμβάνειν, παρά is used (with personal nouns), Luke vi. 34; cf. Diod. S. 13, 31; Lucian. pisc. 7 (ἀπό, when the verb signifies *to take away by force*, Polyb. 22, 26, 8).

c) the Genitive follows ἀποφείγω 2 Pet. i. 4 (but not in 2 Pet. ii. 20), ἀπαλλοτριούν Eph. ii. 12; iv. 18 (Polyb. 3, 77, 7), ἀφιστάναι (deficere a) 1 Tim. iv. 1 (Polyb. 2, 39, 7; 14, 12, 3), ἀποστερείσθαι (fig.) 1 Tim. vi. 5.

d) the Dat. is used after ἀποθνήσκειν *to die to a thing*, Gal. ii. 19; Rom. vi. 2, (in Rom. vi. 10 the Dat. is to be taken differently); similar is ἀπογίνεσθαι ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις 1 Pet. ii. 24.

899 2) Verbs compounded with ἀνά in the *local* sense of *up* (to),
th ed. are construed with,

a) εἰς, when the place to which the motion is directed is indicated, e.g. ἀναβαίνειν *to go* (travel) *up to* Luke xix. 28; Mark 448 x. 32 (Her. 9, 113), or *go up* (upon a mountain, into heaven etc.) Matt. v. 1; xiv. 23; Mark iii. 13 (Herod. 1, 12, 16; Plat. Alcib. 1, 117 b.; Dio C. 89, 97), ἀναβλέπειν Matt. xiv. 19 (Mark vii. 34; Luke ix. 16) Acts xxii. 13, ἀνάγειν Matt. iv. 1; Luke ii. 22; Acts xx. 3 (Herod. 7, 10, 15), ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι Mark xvi. 19, ἀναπίπτειν Luke xiv. 10, ἀναφέρειν Matt. xvii. 1; Luke xxiv. 51, ἀναχωρεῖν Matt. ii. 14; iv. 12 etc., ἀνέρχεσθαι Jno. vi. 3; Gal. i. 18.

b) πρὸς, principally when the point at which the motion terminates is a person; as, ἀναβαίνειν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Jno. xx. 17, ἀνακάμπτειν Matt. ii. 12, ἀναπέμπειν Luke xxiii. 7 (ἀναβλέπ. πρὸς τινα Plat. Phaed. 116 d.; Arrian. Epict. 2, 16, 41), yet ἐπὶ τινα is also used in such cases Luke x. 6 (ἀνακάμπτειν cf. Diod. S. 3, 17), or the Dat. Luke xxiii. 11 ἀναπέμπειν τινί.

c) ἐπὶ, when the goal of the action is to be designated definitely as an eminence or as a surface on which the motion terminates, (Polyb. 8, 31, 1 ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγοράν (*up*) *to the market*, on the other hand ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν like the Latin ascendere Polyb. 10, 4, 6, ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ δικαστήριον frequently in Greek authors). Thus we find ἀναβιβάζειν ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν Matt. xiii. 48 (Xen. C. 4, 2, 28; Polyb. 7, 17, 9), ἐπὶ τὸ κτήνος Luke x. 34 (Palaeph. 1, 9; Xen. C. 4, 5, 16; cf. 7, 1, 38), ἀνακλινεσθαι ἐπὶ τοὺς χόρτους Matt. xiv. 19, ἀναπίπτειν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν Matt. xv. 35 or ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς Mark viii. 6, ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα Luke v. 19, ἐπὶ

συκομορέαν xix. 4 (cf. Xen. C. 4, 1, 7; 6, 4, 4; Her. 4, 22; Plut. educ. 7, 13; Arrian. Epict. 3, 24, 33; Lys. 1; Alcib. 10; Paus. 6, 381 4, 6), ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον upon the wood (cross) 1 Pet. ii. 24,¹ ἀνακάμπτειν ἐπὶ Luke x. 6 (Plut. educ. 17, 13).

3) Verbs compounded with ἀντί (against) are regularly followed by the Dat., as Matt. vii. 2; Luke xiii. 17; Jno. xix. 12; Rom. xiii. 2 etc.; yet see Heb. xii. 4 ἀνταγωνίζεσθαι πρὸς τι (cf. vs. 3 ἡ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογία), similar to which is ἀντικείμεν πρὸς Polyb. 2, 66, 3; Dio C. p. 204 and 777.

4) Verbs compounded with ἐκ are sometimes followed by that preposition (i.e. when *out of* is to be expressed), and sometimes merely by ἀπό or παρά (i.e. when merely direction *from* or *from the vicinity of* is indicated): thus ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ Matt. xiii. 52; Jno. ii. 15; 3 Jno. 10, etc. (Plat. Gorg. 468 d.) and ἀπό Matt. vii. 4, ἐκκλίνειν ἀπό 1 Pet. iii. 11; Rom. xvi. 17, ἐκκόπτειν ἐκ Rom. xi. 24 (Diod. S. 16, 24), ἐκπίπτειν ἐκ Acts xii. 7 (Arrian. Ind. 30, 3), 449 ἐκλέγεσθαι ἐκ Jno. xv. 19 (Plat. legg. 7 p. 811 a.), ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐκ Matt. xv. 11, 18; Rev. ix. 18 (Polyb. 6, 58, 4) and ἀπό Mark vii. 15 400 (var., not Matt. xxiv. 1) or παρά Jno. xv. 26, ἐκφεύγειν ἐκ Acts xix. 16, ἐξαίρειν and ἐξαιρῆν ἐκ 1 Cor. v. 2; Acts xxvi. 17, ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ Matt. ii. 6; Acts vii. 3 etc. (Her. 9, 12) or παρά Luke ii. 1. On the other hand these verbs are but rarely construed with the Genitive, never when used in a local sense except ἐξέρχεσθαι Matt. x. 14 (and even there not quite indubitably, see the variants; yet cf. ἐκβαίνειν τινός Jacobs, Philostr. p. 718); when used figuratively, however, the Gen. is constant with ἐκπίπτειν (like *spe excidere*) Gal. v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 17; Plat. rep. 6, 496 c.; Lucian. contempl. 14 (yet with ἐκ Her. 3, 14; Dio C. p. 1054, 57), and ἐκκρέμασθαι Luke xix. 48. Lastly, ἐκφεύγειν even in a physical sense takes the Acc. (of the force): 2 Cor. xi. 33 ἐκφεύγειν τὰς χεῖράς τινος (Sus. 22), cf. Her. 6, 40 and frequently; ἐκ occurs after this verb merely to denote locality in Acts xix. 16 ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου, cf. Sir. xxvii. 20.

5) The construction of verbs compounded with ἐν is very simple: when they signify direction *to* (towards) something, they are followed by εἰς; when they denote rest *in*, or *on*, a place, they are followed by ἐν, e.g. ἐμβαίνειν εἰς Matt. viii. 23; xiv. 22; Jno. vi. 17 (Her. 2, 29; Plat. Crat. 397 a.), ἐμβάλλειν εἰς Luke xii. 5 (Dio C. p. 288, 79; Plat. Tim. 91 c.; Lucian. Tim. 21), ἐμβάπτειν εἰς Mark xiv. 20 (but with ἐν Matt. xxvi. 23 *dip in the dish*),

¹ With the Acc. alone we find ἀναβαίνειν ἵππον, Dion. H. 2252, 7; Pausan. 10, 19, 6.

ἐμβλέπειν εἰς Matt. vi. 26 ; Acts i. 11, ἐμπίπτειν εἰς Luke x. 36 (Her. 7, 43 ; Plat. Tim. 84 c. ; Lucian. Hermot. 59) 1 Tim. iii. 6, ἐμπτύειν εἰς Matt. xxvi. 67 ; xxvii. 30, but ἐνδημεῖν ἐν 2 Cor. v. 6, ἐνοικεῖν ἐν 2 Cor. vi. 16 ; Col. iii. 16 (with Acc. Her. 2, 178), ἐνεργεῖν ἐν Phil. ii. 13 ; Eph. i. 20 etc., ἐγγράφειν ἐν 2 Cor. iii. 2 (like ἐγγλύφειν ἐν Her. 2, 4), ἐμμένειν ἐν (τῇ διαθήκῃ) Heb. viii. 9. At the same time, in both significations the construction with the Dat. occurs not unfrequently, cf. ἐμβλέπειν τινί (of a person). Mark x. 21, 27 ; Luke xxii. 61 ; Jno. i. 36, 43 (Plat. rep. 10, 609 d. ; Polyb. 15, 28, 3), ἐμπτύειν τινί Mark x. 34 ; xiv. 65 ; xv. 19, ἐμμένειν τινί (πίστει) Acts xiv. 22 (Xen. Mem. 4, 4, 4 ; Lycurg. 19, 4 ; 382 Lucian. Tim. 102). Ἐντροφᾶν *to revel in something* is construed 6th ed. in Greek authors with the Dat. alone (e.g. Diod. S. 19, 71) ; on the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 13 ἐν is repeated. In Rom. xi. 24 ἐγκεντρίζειν is construed first with εἰς and then with the Dat.

6) Still more simple is the construction of verbs compounded with εἰς, such as εἰσάγειν, εἰσπορεύεσθαι, εἰσφέρειν, εἰσέρχεσθαι ; viz. 450 they uniformly repeat εἰς, cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 210 ; yet see Hm. Eurip. Ion p. 98, and my second Progr. de Verb. comp. p. 13.

7) Of the verbs compounded with ἐπί, some are construed with that preposition (more rarely with εἰς), and some with the Dative alone ; yet many take either construction indifferently : ἐπιβάλλειν εἰς (*into*) or ἐπί τι (*upon* Plat. Prot. 334 b.) Mark iv. 37 ; Luke v. 36 ; ix. 62, also with the Dat. of the person 1 Cor. vii. 35 ; Mark 401 xi. 7 ; Acts iv. 3 (Polyb. 3, 2, 8 ; 3, 5, 5),¹ ἐπιβαίνειν ἐπί or εἰς 7th ed. Acts xxi. 6 ; xx. 18 (Matt. xxi. 5), also with a local Dat. Acts xxvii. 2 (Polyb. 1, 5, 2 ; Diod. S. 16, 66), ἐπιβλέπειν ἐπί Luke i. 48 ; Jas. ii. 3 ; Plut. educ. 4, 9 (with εἰς Plat. Phaedr. 63 a.), ἐπικεῖσθαι ἐπί τινι Jno. xi. 38, also with the Dat. of the person 1 Cor. ix. 16, ἐπιπίπτειν ἐπί τι Luke i. 12 ; Acts x. 10, or ἐπί τινι Acts viii. 16, or with the Dat. of the person Mark iii. 10 ; Acts xx. 10 (Polyb. 1, 24, 4), ἐπιρρίπτειν ἐπί τι 1 Pet. v. 7, ἐπιτιθέναι ἐπί τι Mark iv. 21 ; Matt. xxiii. 4 ; Acts ix. 17 etc., or with the Dative, mostly of the person Luke xxiii. 26 ; Mark vii. 32 ; Acts ix. 12 ; 1 Tim. v. 22 etc., rarely of the thing Jno. xix. 2 (Lucian. Tim. 41, 122), ἐπέρχεσθαι ἐπί τι Luke i. 35 ; Acts viii. 24 ; xiii. 40 or with the Dative of the thing Luke xxi. 26, ἐπαίρειν ἐπί or εἰς τι Jno. xiii. 18 ; Luke xviii. 13, ἐποικοδομεῖν ἐπί τι 1 Cor. iii. 12 or

¹ On ἐπιβάλλειν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τινὰ and τινί (Lucian. Tim. 10) in particular, see Fr. Mr. p. 637. We find in a material sense in Polyæn. 5, 2, 12 ποίᾳ πόλει βούλομαι ἐπιπλεῦσαι.

τινι Eph. ii. 20, but also ἐν Col. ii. 7, ἐπιδεῖν ἐπὶ τι Acts iv. 29, ἐπιφέρειν with the Dat. of the thing Phil. i. 17, ἐφικνεῖσθαι εἰς τινα 2 Cor. x. 14, ἐφάλλεσθαι ἐπὶ τινα Acts xix. 16 (1 Sam. x. 6; xi. 6). On the other hand, ἐπυγράφειν is construed with ἐν, 2 Cor. iii. 2 cf. Plat. de lucri cupid. p. 229 etc.; Palaeph. 47, 5 (differently in Num. xvii. 2; Prov. vii. 3). Ἐπεκτείνεισθαι Phil. iii. 14 (*stretch one's self out after*) and, when joined to names of persons, ἐπιφαίνειν and ἐπιφαύειν invariably take the Dative alone, Eph. v. 14; Luke i. 79 (cf. Gen. xxxv. 7); so also does ἐπιφέρειν in the sense of adding something to something, Phil. i. 17. Ἐπισκιάζειν has sometimes the Dative of the person, as in Acts v. 15 and probably in Mark ix. 7 (*to make a sheltering shade for one*, cf. Ps. xc. 4), and sometimes the Acc. Matt. xvii. 5; Luke ix. 34 (*overshadow, envelope*, as transitive). In the Sept. we find also ἐπισκιάζ. ἐπὶ τινα Ps. cxxxix. 8; Exod. xl. 29.

8) Of the verbs compounded with διὰ, there are but few in which the preposition is particularly prominent: cf. in the N. T. διαπορεύεσθαι διὰ σπορίμων Luke vi. 1, cf. D. S. exc. Vat. p. 30 (but we find also διαπορεύεσθαι πόλεις, yet in the sense of *obire*, 451 Acts xvi. 4), διέρχεσθαι διὰ Matt. xii. 43; 2 Cor. i. 16 *to pass through* (and consequently out of) something, cf. Strabo 8, 332, and the pregnant διασώζειν δι' ὕδατος 1 Pet. iii. 20. Most of them are construed like transitives, with the Acc., e.g. διαπλεῖν *sail* 383 *through* Acts xxvii. 5, likewise διέρχεσθαι when it signifies *pass* 6th ed. *through* Luke xix. 1; Acts xv. 3, διαβαίνειν Heb. xi. 29 etc.

9) Verbs compounded with κατά which denote an action descending upon a local point, take ἀπό or ἐκ when the *terminus a quo* is to be expressed, e.g. καταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Luke ix. 54; 1 Thess. iv. 16, καταβ. ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. Jno. iii. 13; vi. 41; when the *terminus ad quem* is to be indicated (Dio C. 108, 23; 741, 96) they take ἐπὶ, εἰς, or πρὸς, according to the respective nature of the point in view, Luke xxii. 44; Mark xiii. 15; Acts xiv. 11, perhaps the Dative alone in Acts xx. 9 καταφέρεισθαι ὑπνῳ.¹ On the other hand, καθῆσθαι, καθίζειν, κατατιθέναι ἐν τινι signify 402 *to set down on some place*, etc. Κατηγορεῖν *to accuse*, in as far 7th ed. as the notion of κατά is retained, is usually construed with the Gen. of the person; κατηγορεῖν τι κατά τινος occurs once, Luke xxiii. 14, and similarly ἐγκαλεῖν κατά τινος Rom. viii. 33; cf. Soph. Philoct. 328. Analogous to κατηγορεῖν with the Gen. is Rom.

¹ As we find elsewhere καταφέρεισθαι εἰς ὕπνον or ἐφ' ὕπνου, see Kühnbl in loc. Otherwise ὕπνῳ might also be taken as Ablative.

xi. 18 κατακαυχᾶσθαι τινος *boast against something* cf. Jas. ii. 13, and καταμαρτυρεῖν τινος Matt. xxvi. 62; xxvii. 13; but κατακαυχ-
κατά τινος Jas. iii. 14.

10) Verbs compounded with μετά in which this preposition signifies *trans*, as μεταβαίνειν, μεταμορφοῦν, μετασχηματίζειν, μετανοεῖν, μετοικίζειν etc., naturally take εἰς to denote passing over *into*, cf. Vig. p. 639.

11) Verbs compounded with παρά, are followed by ἀπό or παρά (yet see § 47 pp. 365, 369 ff.) when the place *whence* is to be expressed, e.g. Acts i. 25 ἀφ' ἧς (ἀποστολῆς) παρέβη (Dent. xvii. 20; Josh. xi. 15, etc.), according to others ἐξ ἧς (Dent. ix. 12, 16); παραλαμβάνειν ἀπό τινος 1 Cor. xi. 23 and παρά τ. 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 6, παραφέρειν ἀπό τ. Mark xiv. 36; Luke xxii. 42, παρέρχεσθαι ἀπό τ. Matt. v. 18; Mark xiv. 35.

12) Most verbs compounded with περί have become regular transitives, and accordingly govern the Acc.; as, περιέρχεσθαι 1 Tim. v. 13 (obire), περιζωνύναι Eph. vi. 14, περιῤυστάναι Acts xxv. 7. In a material sense, with περί repeated, we find once
452 περιαστρέπτειν Acts xxii. 6 (in the parallel passage Acts ix. 3 it is used as transitive), περιζώννυσθαι Rev. xv. 6 (περὶ τὰ στήθη), περικεῖσθαι Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 2 (περισπᾶσθαι Luke x. 40), but with Dat. περιπίπτειν (λησταῖς, πειρασμοῖς) Luke x. 30; Jas. i. 2 (Thuc. 2, 54; Polyb. 3, 53, 6; Lycurg. 19, 1) and περικεῖσθαι Heb. xii. 1.

13) Of verbs compounded with πρό, only προπορεύεσθαι Luke i. 76 repeats the preposition: προπορεύσῃ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου (Dent. ix. 3); in the Sept. ἐνώπιον is also used Ps. lxxxiv. 14; xcvi. 3 and ἔμπροσθεν Gen. xxxii. 16; Isaiah lviii. 8. So in Luke i. 17 προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (but in xxii. 47 προήρχετο αὐτούς). Further, see above, No. 2.

14) Verbs compounded with πρὸς repeat that preposition when *towards* in a local sense is to be indicated, e.g. προσπίπτειν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τινός Mark vii. 25; cf. Dio C. 932, 82; 1275, 53 (but προσπίπτειν τοῖς γόνασι Diod. S. 17, 13), προστίθεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς
384 πατέρας Acts xiii. 36; also προσκολλᾶσθαι πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα *cleave*
841 *to his wife* Mark x. 7; Eph. v. 31. On the other hand, with ἐπὶ in Matt. vi. 27 προστίθεναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν. More rarely the Dat. alone is used, e.g. προσέρχ. ὄρει Heb. xii. 22, προσπίπτειν οἰκίᾳ Matt. vii. 25 (Xen. eq. 7, 6; Philostr. Apol. v. 21), and of direction, προσφωνεῖν τινι *call to* Matt. xi. 16; Acts xxii. 2, cf. Diod. S. 4, 48 (but προσφωνεῖν τινι *call one hither* Luke vi. 13). On the other

hand, the Dat. alone is almost invariably used when the object approached is a person, e.g. *προσπίπτειν τινί* (to fall down before one) Mark iii. 11; v. 33; Acts xvi. 29, *προσφέρειν τωί* (Philostr. Apol. v. 22), *προσέρχεσθαι τινι* to draw near to one, or when the approaching is itself to be taken figuratively, e.g. *προσάγειν τῷ θεῷ* to bring to God 1 Pet. iii. 18 (in Sept. *προσάγειν τῷ κυρίῳ* frequently), *προσκλίνεσθαι τινι* to attach one's self to Acts v. 36 cf. *προσέχειν τινί* Heb. vii. 13; Acts xvi. 14, *προσεύχεσθαι τινι* Matt. vi. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 18, *προστίθεναι λόγον τινί* Heb. xii. 19, *προστίθεσθαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* Acts ii. 41. If the verb implies rest (*πρός τινι*), it is construed either thus with the Dat. alone, as *προσμένειν τινί* Acts xi. 23; 1 Tim. v. 5, *προσεδρεύειν* 1 Cor. ix. 13 (Polyb. 8, 9, 11; 38, 5, 9), *προσκαρτερεῖν* Mark iii. 9; Col. iv. 2; Rom. xii. 12; cf. Polyb. 1, 55, 4; 1, 59, 12; Diod. S. 20, 48 etc., or (in strictly local relations) with *ἐν*, e.g. *προσμένειν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* 1 Tim. i. 3.

15) Verbs compounded with *σύν* but rarely repeat that preposition Col. ii. 13 (*συζωοποιεῖν*), or take instead of it *μετά* (Weber, Demosth. 210) Matt. xxv. 19 (*συναίρειν*), 2 Cor. viii. 18 (*συμπέμπειν*), Matt. xx. 2 (*συμφωνεῖν*), xvii. 3 (*συλλαλεῖν*), Mark xiv. 54; 453 they are most frequently construed with the Dat. alone, instances of which occur on nearly every page of the N. T. (also in 1 Cor. xiii. 6; Jas. ii. 22, not in Rom. vii. 22). In classical Greek this construction is almost the only one used. Acts i. 26 *συγκατεψήφισθη μετὰ τῶν ἑνδεκα ἀποστόλων* is a pregnant expression.

16) Of the verbs compounded with *ὑπό* none repeat the preposition; but when they denote direction *towards* (*ὑπάγειν*, *ὑποστρέφειν* etc.) they take *εἰς* or *πρός*, and when the *ὑπό* means *under*, as in *ὑποπλεῖν*, they are used as transitives.

17) Verbs compounded with *ὑπέρ* are for the most part used absolutely. Only *ὑπερεντυγχάνειν* repeats *ὑπέρ* Rom. viii. 26 (var.), cf. Judith v. 21; Sir. xxxvi. 27; and *ὑπερφρονεῖν* is construed with *παρά* in Rom. xii. 3. *ὑπερβαίνειν* in 1 Thess. iv. 6 and *ὑπεριδεῖν* in Acts xvii. 30 are used transitively in a figurative sense.

Note. The N. T. contains no decided instance of the usage, not very rare in Greek authors, according to which the preposition of a compound verb influences also a second verb (Franke, Dem. p. 30).

§ 53. CONJUNCTIONS.

1. Conjunctions, particles designed to connect words and sentences, classify themselves according to the various species of

connection, which are the same in all cultivated languages and are 385 eight in number (Krü. 308) ; cf. O. Jahn, grammaticor. gr. de 6th ed. conjunctionibus doctrina Gryph. 1847.

The primitive conjunctions are monosyllabic : *καί, τοι, τε, δέ, μέν,* 404 *οὐν*. Many are obviously derived from pronouns or adjectives : 7th ed. *ὅτε, ὅτι, ὥς, τοι, ἀλλά* etc. Others are compound : *ἐάν (εἰ ἄν),* *ἐπεί, ὥστε, γάρ (γε ἄρα), τοίνυν* etc. Some are construed with a 454 particular mood according to their signification (*εἰ, ἐάν, ἵνα, ὅπως, ὅτε* etc.). See, in general, Hm. emend. p. 164 sqq.

The principal conjunctions (of all the various classes) used in Greek prose are employed in the N. T., and in their legitimate senses.¹ But *τοι, μήν* (by themselves) do not occur ; many compounds also, the more refined niceties of expression (e.g. *γούν*), were unnecessary in the style of the N. T.

It is further to be specially remarked, that causal conjunctions (as *ὅτι, ἐπεί, ἐπειδή*) originally designated for the most part something present, either tangible or temporal ; — a connection of ideas observable also in the case of prepositions (p. 360 sq.), and which occurs likewise in Latin and German (quod, quoniam, quando, quandoquidem, weil).

2. The most simple and most general connection of words and sentences, the mere coupling of contiguous words and sentences, is formed by *καί* and *τε* (*et* and *que*), the latter of which occurs oftenest in Luke, particularly in the Acts, and then in the Epistle to the Hebrews : Matt. ii. 13 *παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον*, Acts x. 22 *ἀνὴρ* φοβούμενος τ. θεόν, μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὄλου τοῦ ἔθνους*, iv. 13 *θεωροῦντες . . . ἐθαύμαζον, ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτούς* etc. The distinction between *καί* and *τε* is this : *καί* is conjunctive (of something co-ordinate), *τε* is adjunctive (of something accessory). Says Hermann, *καί* conjungit, *τε* adjungit ; with which cf. Klotz, Devar. II. 744.² Hence *τε* denotes rather an internal (logical) relation ; *καί*, rather an external.

Observation shows that in the N. T. also *τε*³ designates something

¹ Schleiermacher, Hermen. S. 66 goes too far ; on S. 130 his opinion is more correct. It is only in reference to the position of certain conjunctions that the language of the N. T. departs from the earlier prose.

² Cf. the different views of philologists as to *καί* and *τε* (originating in *τοι* Hm. Soph. Trach. 1015) Hm. Vig. 835 ; ad Eurip. Med. p. 331 ; Hand de partic. *τε*, Jen. 1832. 2 Progr. 4to. ; Bhdy. 482 f. ; Sommer in the n. Jahrbuch. f. Philol. 1831. III. 400 f. ; Hartung, Part. I. 58 ff.

³ As to the Latin *que*, see Zumpt, Gr. § 333 ; Hand, Tursellin. II. 467 sq. ; cf. Bauermeister, über die Copulativpartikeln im Latein. Luckau, 1853. 4to.

additional, supplementary, explanatory, flowing from what precedes, or even its details (Rost 722 f.), Jno. vi. 18; Acts ii. 33, 37; iv. 33; v. 42; vi. 7; viii. 13, 28, 31; x. 28, 48; xi. 21; xii. 6; xv. 4, 39; xix. 12; xx. 7; xxi. 18; Rom. xvi. 26; — hence usually something of inferior importance, Jno. iv. 42; Acts xvi. 34. Sometimes, however, *τε* has the effect to give prominence: in Heb. ix. 1 *εἶχε καὶ ἡ πρώτη (διαθήκη) δικαιώματα λατρείας τό τε ἄγον κοσμικόν*, the last particular is subjoined by *τε* as something specific and implied in *δικ. λατρ.*; but when the author in vs. 2 sqq. speaks of the sanctuary in detail, he takes this specification as his leading idea. There is nothing strange in this; for that which is not co-ordinate (*καί*) with what precedes but is merely annexed to it, may just as well, according to circumstances, be more important as less; cf., further, Heb. xii. 2. Indeed, it may be remarked generally (Klotz l. c.), that the private views of the writer often have much to do in deciding him to choose *τε*; and that *τε* and *δέ* were early interchanged in the N. T. by transcribers (Acts vii. 26; viii. 6; ix. 24; xi. 13; xii. 8, 12; xiii. 44; xxvi. 20, etc.).

3. In the N. T., as in the Biblical style generally, the simple connection by means of *καί*¹ is often chosen, even where in a more artificial diction some more specific conjunction would have been employed. This circumstance led the earlier biblical philologists to the erroneous assumption, that in the N. T. *καί*, like the Hebrew *ו*, was a sort of conjunction-general, combining in itself the significations of all conjunctions whatever, and of many adverbs besides (see still Schleusner's lexic. under the word).

But in the N. T., as in Greek authors (Klotz, Devar. II. 635), *καί* has only two significations: *and* and *also*.² These significations, however, comprehend several shades of meaning, which we express by special words: thus *also* is intensified into *even*, *vel*, *adeo* (Fr. Rom. I. 270; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 50). In many passages, however, this is not the case, but *καί* as a simple copula was chosen by the writer either in accordance with the simplicity of Biblico-Oriental thought, or designedly on rhetorical grounds; sometimes both causes concur. A translator should not efface the coloring of the style by employing more specific conjunctions.

¹ The *and* uniting separate clauses deserves perhaps special mention only in the case, often overlooked, where a writer tacks one O. T. quotation to another e.g. Acts i. 20 *γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυσις ... ἐν αὐτῇ* (Ps. lxix.), *καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ... ἔτερος* (Ps. cix.); Heb. i. 9 f. (see Bleek); Rom. ix. 33.

² Klotz, as above: In omnibus locis, ubicunque habetur *καί* particula, aut simpliciter copulat duas res, aut ita ponitur ut praeter alias res, quae aut re vera positae sunt aut facile cogitatione suppleri possunt, hanc vel illam rem esse aut fieri significet, et in priore causa *und* reddi solet, in posteriore *etiam*, *quoque*, *vel*, sicuti res ac ratio in singulis locis requirit.

— As to the other uses of *καί*, inasmuch as they are referrible to the significations *and* and *also*, we have only to note :

a. *Καί* before interrogatives, Mark x. 26 *καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι*; Luke x. 29; Jno. ix. 36; 1 Pet. iii. 13; 2 Cor. ii. 2 (familiar enough from the Greek authors, Plat. Theaet. 188 d.; Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 13; 6, 3, 22; Lucian. Herm. 84; Diog. L. 6, 93; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 30; the Latin *et*, too, is so used), comes under the signification *and*. We also say, *Und was that er?* *And what did he do?*—in an abrupt, hurried question, barring further discussion. On the other hand, *καί* never occurs in the N. T. before the Imperative to imply urgency (Hoogeveen, doct. partic. I. 538 sqq.; Hartung I. 148). All the instances formerly alleged in support of this usage are of a different nature. In Matt. xxiii. 32 the *καί* is consecutive: ye profess to be sons etc., fill ye up then etc. In Luke xii. 29 *καί* denotes *also* or *and* (consequently). In Mark xi. 29 *καί* is *and*; in 1 Cor. xi. 6 *also*. The strengthening *καί* after interrogatives, as in Rom. viii. 24 *ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει*; *why doth he yet hope for?* is reducible to the 7th ed. sense of *also*.

b. *Καί* never occurs strictly as adversative. In the first place, passages in which *καὶ οὐ*, *καὶ μή* (Fr. Mr. p. 31), *καὶ οὐδέ*, etc. occurs—Matt. xi. 17; 388 xii. 39; xxvi. 60; Mark i. 22; vii. 24; ix. 18; Jno. iii. 11, 32; vii. 30 6th ed. (on the contrary, vs. 44); x. 25; xiv. 30; Acts xii. 19; Col. ii. 8, etc.—must be set aside, as in these the contrast lies in the negation, and is neither strengthened by *δέ* nor weakened by a simple *καί* (Schaeff. Dem. I. 645). Even in such sentences as Mark xii. 12 *ἐξήρουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι κ. ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον*, 1 Thess. ii. 18 *ἠελησάμεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς . . . καὶ ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς*, Jno. vii. 28; 1 Jno. v. 19, the writer probably viewed the two particulars as co-existing side by side, though we are more inclined to emphasize the opposition. And in Acts x. 28; Matt. xx. 10 (*the first supposed that they would receive more; and they also received every man a denarion*) we also employ *and* to give prominence to an unexpected result, see above. No one now will think it strange that in 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6 *δέ* and *καί* are used alternately. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xvi. 9 two circumstances (one favorable and one unfavorable) detaining Paul in Ephesus are united; *καί* therefore is the simple copula.¹

c. The exegetical, more closely defining, *καί* *namely* (Hm. Philoct. 458 1408; Bremi, Demosth. p. 179; cf. Vc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 9; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 33 sq.; Weber, Demosth. p. 438) is primarily only *and* (*and indeed*), Jno. i. 16 *out of his fulness have we all received, namely* (that is) *grace for grace*, 1 Cor. iii. 5; xv. 38; Eph. vi. 18; Gal. vi. 16; Heb. xi. 17; Acts xxiii. 6. But this force has been attributed to *καί* in too many passages: in Matt. xiii. 41; xvii. 2; xxi. 5 *καί* is simply *and*.

¹ So early a scholar as Hoogeveen perceived that *but* (*however*) is not the proper meaning of *καί*: sciant non ex se sed ex oppositorum membrorum natura hanc (notionem) nactam esse *καί* particulam (doct. particul. I. 533).

In Mark xi. 28 the true reading [sustained also by Cod. Sin.] is probably ἡ. In Matt. iii. 5 to render καὶ ἡ περὶχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου by *namely the country about the Jordan*, would be to join an incongruous adjunct to ἡ Ἰουδαία, as the two geographical notions do not exactly coincide nor is the former comprehended in the latter. The phraseology resembles, All Hesse and the Rhine-region; all Baden and Breisgau, cf. Krü. 318. In the expression θεὸς καὶ πατήρ the meaning of καὶ is simply *and* (at the same time), not *namely, that is*.

d. It may be doubted whether καὶ ever signifies *especially* (Bornem. Luc. 78; Fr. Mr. p. 11) when to a general term one that is special and strictly speaking already included in the former is added: in Mark i. 5 ἐξεπορεύετο πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται πάντες, xvi. 7 the specification is made prominent by its very position, but καὶ simply signifies *and*. Cf. Heb. vi. 10. On the other hand, when a special term precedes, καὶ is sometimes put immediately before the general expression which includes the former, as in Matt. xxvi. 59 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι
408 καὶ τὸ συνέδριον ὅλον *and* (in one word, to sum up) *the whole sanhedrim*, see Fr. Mt. 786; Mr. 652; cf. Vc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 67, Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 83 and rep. II. 212. Καὶ stands at the close of an entire exposition (before the final result) in Heb. iii. 19 (and according to some Codd. in 1 Cor. v. 13).

e. When καὶ signifies *also* (which is not the case e.g. in Eph. v. 2),¹ it
389 may be sometimes translated by *precisely, just, very* (eben, ja) (Hm. Vig. 8th ed. 837; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 419): Heb. vii. 26 τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεὺς, ὅσιος etc. for such a high priest just became us, vi. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 8 (Jno. viii. 25), Col. iii. 15; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 12. Elsewhere it might be rendered by *vicissim* 1 Cor. i. 8; Phil. ii. 9; but *also* is quite sufficient.

f. When καὶ occurs in the secondary clause after a particle of time (ὅτε, ὡς), as in Luke ii. 21 ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ τοῦ περιτεμῆν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, or vii. 12 ὡς ἤγγισε τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκώς, Acts i. 10; x. 17, the proper construction
459 would be: ἐπλήσθ. δὲ ἡμέραι . . . καὶ ἐκλήθη, ἤγγισε τῇ πύλῃ . . . καὶ ἐξεκομ. On the other hand, in Jno. i. 19 we must not (as even BCrus. does) join ὅτε ἀπίστευαν . . . καὶ ὡμολόγησε, but ὅτε ἀπίστευαν etc. is to be connected with αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία etc., see Lücke in loc. On καὶ commencing a parenthesis, e.g. Rom. i. 13 (Fr. in loc.), see § 62, 1. On καὶ γάρ see no. 8 p. 448; and on καὶ δέ, no. 7 p. 443. In Luke xix. 42 and Acts ii. 18 we find καὶ γε *et quidem*, and that without a word intervening, a usage that does not occur in the earlier written language. As to later authors, see Klotz, Devar. II. 318.

¹ As to καὶ *also* after relatives (Heb. i. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 23, etc.), see Klotz, Devar. II. 336; but, in general, Krü. 319. The exact meaning of the *also, even*, must always be gathered from the context. Καὶ is repeated several times in succession by way of climax in 1 Cor. xv. 1 f.

4. Connection in the form of *correlation* takes place, when two words or clauses are joined as corresponding to each other,¹ by means of *καί* ... *καί* (*τε* ... *τε* Acts xxvi. 16) or *τε* ... *καί*. The first formula (*καί* ... *καί*) is used when the writer from the very first conceives both members as co-ordinate, *et* ... *et* (*both* ... *and*, *as well* ... *as*); the latter, when he appends to the first member a second (*et* ... *que*, *not only* ... *but also*) Klotz, Devar. II. 740; Matt. x. 28 ὁ δυνάμενος καὶ ψυχὴν κ. σῶμα ἀπολέσαι, 1 Cor. x. 32 ἐπρόσκοποι καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι κ. Ἕλλησιν καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, Phil. iii. 10; v. 3; Acts xxi. 12 παρεκαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἐντότιοι, Luke ii. 16 ἐνέυρον τὴν τε Μαριάμ καὶ τ. Ἰωσήφ καὶ τὸ βρέφος etc., Krü. 327. In the former case, the members are combined as into one whole (or compact group); in the latter, the second member is to be viewed as something added to the first, while the respective importance of each is not thereby pronounced upon (Rost 134, 5 c.); cf. Acts iv. 27; v. 24; Rom. i. 14; Heb. xi. 32 etc. In the course of lengthened enumerations, groups (pairs) are thus formed by 409 *τε* ... *καί* (... *καί*), as in Heb. xi. 32 Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψών κ. 7th ed. Ἰεφθάς, Δαυὶδ τε κ. Σαμουὴλ κ. τῶν προφητῶν, 1 Cor. i. 30; Heb. vi. 2; Acts ii. 9, 10; Phil. i. 7.

Καί ... *καί* connect not merely things similar but also things contrasted, as in Jno. vi. 36 καὶ ἐώρακάτέ με καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε the seeing and the not believing both occur, in xv. 24, probably also in xvii. 25. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. vii. 38 the co-ordination of the contraries is disturbed in the second member by a comparison. On the correspondence between *τε* and *δέ*, according to which the latter particle denotes, along with connection, some opposition (*lenis oppositio* Klotz, Devar. II. 741) as in Acts 390 xxii. 28 *and the chief captain answered ... but Paul said*, xix. 3, see Stallb. 6th ed. Plat. Phileb. p. 36, and rep. II. 350; Hm. Eur. Med. p. 362 sq.; Klotz l.c. *Τε* and *καί* are placed either immediately together between the two 460 words thus formed into a group, as in Luke xxi. 11 φόβητρά τε καὶ σημεῖα, Acts ix. 18, or are separated by one or two of the connected words, as in Luke xxiii. 12 ὁ τε Πιλάτ. καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης, Jno. ii. 15; Acts ii. 43 πολλά τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα, x. 39 ἐν τε τῇ χώρᾳ τ. Ἰουδαίων καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ, Rom. i. 20; Acts xxviii. 23 etc., in which case the article, preposition, or adjective serves also for the second member. Otherwise in Phil. i. 7 ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ etc. (In Acts xix. 27; xxi. 28 we find *τε καί* in one and the same clause, *que etiam*, a combination rare in Greek authors, though not to be rejected.)

¹ Such passages as Mark ii. 26 καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ ὁδοῦν, Jno. v. 27, where *καί* ... *καί* are not parallel to each other but the second signifies *also*, do not come under this head, cf. Soph. Philoct. 274.

5. Correlation is brought out with greatest precision in the form of *comparison*: *ὡς* (*ὥσπερ, καθὼς*) ... *οὕτως*; frequently *καί* is subjoined to the latter to increase its force, as in Jas. ii. 26 *ὥσπερ τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρὸν ἐστίν, οὕτως καὶ ἡ πλῆσις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν*, Jno. v. 21; Rom. v. 18, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 2 Cor. i. 7; Eph. v. 24; Heb. v. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 12. Sometimes, in fact, *καί* in the second member actually takes the place of the comparative particle, as in Matt. vi. 10 *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*, Jno. vi. 57; x. 15; xiii. 33; xvii. 18; Acts vii. 51; see Bornem. Luke 71.

The popular style likes to introduce *καί* elsewhere into comparisons, though *also* is already implied in the comparative particle; as, 1 Cor. vii. 7 *θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν*, Luke xi. 1; Acts vii. 51; xv. 8; xxvi. 29. Accordingly *καί* is repeated in both members in Rom. i. 13 *ἵνα τὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῶν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν*, Matt. xviii. 33; Col. iii. 13; Rom. xi. 30 (var.), Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 372; Klotz, Devar. II. 635; Fr. Rom. I. 39; IL 538 sq.

6. *Disjunction* comes next under consideration. Simple disjunction is effected by *ἢ* (which is often repeated, especially in impassioned discourse, Rom. viii. 35) and by *ἢ καὶ or even* (Matt. vii. 10; Luke xviii. 11; Rom. ii. 15; xiv. 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 6; cf. Fr. Rom. I. 122).¹ Correlative disjunction, on the other hand, is expressed by *ἢ ... ἢ, εἴτε ... εἴτε, sive ... sive*, whether single
410 words or entire clauses are contrasted, Matt. vi. 24; 1 Cor. xiv. 6
7th ed. (*ἢτοι ... ἢ* Rom. vi. 16), Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 15, etc.

In the N. T. *ἢ* is never put for *καί*, nor *καί* for *ἢ*, Marle, floril. 124, 195; 461 cf. Schaefer. Demosth. IV. 33.² There are cases, however, in which both 391 particles, each agreeably to its import, may be used with equal correctness 6th ed. (Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 146), e.g. 1 Cor. xiii. 1 and 2 Cor. xiii. 1 (cf. Matt. xviii. 16), also Heraclid. as quoted by Marle.³ When *dissimilia* are joined together by *καί* (Col. iii. 11), they are merely placed in connection as individual objects, and not exhibited expressly as different or opposite.

¹ According to the nature of the thoughts, the second clause, annexed by means of *ἢ καί*, is either to be considered as supplementary (Bengel on Rom. ii. 15) and is of less importance than the first, or *καί* involves an enhancement as in 1 Cor. (Klotz, Devar. II. 592).

² As to *aut* for *et*, see Hand, Tursell. I. 540. On the other hand, disjunction by *ἢ* may in a manner include union by *καί*. When we say: Whoever murders father or mother is guilty of the most heinous crime, we mean of course at the same time that whoever murders both his parents is not less guilty. The *minus* includes the *major*.

³ On *καί ... καί vel ... vel*, see Schoem. Isae. p. 307.

In Matt. vii. 10 by καὶ ἐάν a second case is introduced to which the speaker proceeds (*further*); but the better reading [supported too by Cod. Sin.] is probably ἢ καὶ. In Luke xii. 2 we must supply καὶ οὐδὲν κρυπτόν. In Matt. xii. 27 Schott has correctly rendered καὶ by *porro*. In a sentence constructed like Matt. xii. 37 *or* would be quite inappropriate; no less so in Rom. xiv. 7. It has been urged by Protestants, on controversial grounds, that ἢ is used for καὶ in 1 Cor. xi. 27 δὲ ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου. But, not to mention that in this passage several good Codd. give καὶ (as in vss. 26, 28, 29), ἢ may be explained from the mode then current of partaking of the Lord's Supper, without giving countenance to the Catholic dogma of the communion in one kind, see Bengel and Baumgart. in loc.¹ Should any one insist, however, that ἢ proves a real distinction in the administration of the sacrament, even more would follow (looking at the matter philologically) than the Catholic interpreters could consent to take, viz. that the *cup* alone might be sufficient in the communion. In Acts i. 7 (x. 14); xi. 8; xvii. 29; xxiv. 12; Rom. iv. 13; ix. 11; Eph. v. 3 ἢ is employed in *negative* clauses (Thuc. 1, 122; Aelian. anim. 16, 39; Sext. Empir. hypot. 1, 69; Fr. Rom. III. 191 sq.; Jacobs, Philostr. imag. p. 374 and Aelian. anim. p. 457), where in Latin also *aut* is used for *et* (Cic. Tusc. 5, 17; Catil. 1, 6, 15; Tac. Annal. 3, 54 etc.; Hand, Turs. I. 534), and in οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστὶν γινῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς the negation applies equally to γινῶναι χρόνους and γινῶναι καιροὺς (the attention may be directed to the one *or* the other), so that the sense is exactly equivalent to γν. χρόν. καὶ καιροὺς. When, lastly, καὶ and ἢ occur in parallel passages (Matt. xxi. 23; Luke xx. 2), the relation was differently 411 conceived by the different writers. It would be a manifest abuse of 7th ed. parallelism to attempt to prove from this that the two particles are synonymous. Besides, these two particles have been not unfrequently interchanged by transcribers (Jno. viii. 14; Acts x. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 1 etc.; 462 Maetzner, Antiph. p. 97). Cf. also Fr. Mr. 275 sq.; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 11; whereas Tholuck, Bergpred. S. 132 f., reaches no very clear result.

7. *Antithesis* is expressed sometimes by the simple adversatives (δέ, ἀλλά), sometimes by a concessive construction (μέντοι, ὅμως, ἀλλά γε). A mutual relation of contrast, and consequently a combination of antithetical clauses, was originally indicated by μὲν ... δέ (1 Pet. iii. 18; iv. 6); but this relation was ultimately weakened into mere correspondence (Rom. viii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 23), and 392 became logically even inferior to parallelism by means of καὶ ... 6th ed. καὶ (Hartung II. 403 ff.).

The particles ἀλλά and δέ differ in general like *sed* and *autem* (*vero*), see

¹ Even according to our mode of communing it is conceivable that one may receive the bread devoutly, but the cup with sensuous (perhaps sinful) distraction. Accordingly we, too, could say, Whoever receiveth bread *or* cup unworthily.

Hand, Tursellin. I. 559, cf. 425 : The former (the Neut. Plur. of ἄλλος with a different accent, Klotz, Devar. II. 1 sq.), which may often be translated by *yet, nevertheless, imo*, expresses proper and strict opposition (cancelling a previous statement or indicating that it is to be disregarded); the latter (weakened from δὴ Klotz, l. c. p. 355) connects while it contrasts, i.e. adds another particular different from what precedes (Schneider, Vorles. I. 220). When a negation precedes, we find οὐκ ... ἀλλὰ *not... but*, and also οὐ (μὴ) ... δέ *not... but (but rather)*, e.g. Acts xii. 9, 14; Heb. iv. 13; vi. 12; Jas. v. 12; Rom. iii. 4, οὕτως ... δέ Heb. ii. 8 (Thuc. 4, 86; Xen. C. 4, 3, 13; cf. Hartung, Partik. I. 171; Klotz, Devar. II. 360). On ἀλλά and δέ we remark specially that,

a) ἀλλά is used when a train of thought is broken off or interrupted, whether by an objection (Rom. x. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 35; Jno. vii. 27; Klotz, Devar. II. 11; cf. Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 9; 4, 2, 16; Cyr. 1, 6, 9), or by a correction (Mark xiv. 36; 2 Cor. xi. 1), or by a question (Heb. iii. 16; cf. Xen. C. 1, 3, 11; Klotz II. 13), or by an encouragement, command, request (Acts x. 20; xxvi. 16; Matt. ix. 18; Mark ix. 22; Luke vii. 7; Jno. xii. 27; cf. Xen. C. 1, 5, 13; 2, 2, 4; 5, 5, 24; Arrian. Al. 5, 26, 3; see Palairot p. 298; Krebs p. 208; Klotz, Devar. II. 5); for in all these instances something different is advanced subversive of what precedes. Cf. also Jno. viii. 26 and Lücke in loc. In a *consequent* clause (after conditional particles) ἀλλά, like the Latin *at*, gives it an adversative emphasis, and so strengthens it: 1 Cor. iv. 15 ἐὰν μυρίους παιδαγωγούς ἔχημι ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀλλ' οὐ πολλοὺς πατέρας (*yet not, still*), 2 Cor. iv. 16; xi. 6; xiii. 4; Col. ii. 5 (cf. Her. 4, 120; Xen. C. 8, 6, 18; Lucian. pisc. 24; Aelian. anim. 11, 31; see Kypke II. 197; Niebuhr ind. ad Agath. p. 409; Klotz, Devar. II. 93). (The case is different in Rom. vi. 5 εἰ σίμφονται 412 γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα 7th ed. ... surely *we shall be also* etc., see Fr. in loc.) The use of ἀλλά, when 463 after a negative question it absorbs the answer *no*, as in Matt. xi. 8 τί ἐξήλθατε θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον; ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; and 1 Cor. vi. 6; x. 20; Jno. vii. 48 sq., requires no explanation (see Schweigh. Arrian. Epict. II. II. 839; Raphel. ad 1 Cor. as above). In Phil. iii. 8 ἀλλὰ μὲν οὖν signifies *at sane quidem*; ἀλλά opposing the Pres. ἡγούμεναι as a correction to the Perf. ἡγήμαι.¹ In Rom. v. 14, 15 ἀλλά occurs 393 twice in succession, in different relations; in 1 Cor. vi. 11 it is repeated 6th ed. several times, emphatically, in one and the same relation.

¹ 'Αλλ' ἢ after a direct or indirect negation, which occurs (occasionally in the Sept. e.g. Job vi. 5 and) three times in the N. T. (Luke xii. 51; 2 Cor. i. 13 and 1 Cor. iii. 5, — but in the last passage is probably spurious), must according to the careful investigation of Klotz, Devar. p. 31 sqq., who followed Krüger (de formulae ἀλλ' ἢ et affinium particular. post negation. vel negat. sententias usurpatar. natura et usu. Brunsvic. 1834. 4to.), be referred to ἄλλο and not to ἀλλά. (In Luke as above *I am not come on earth to bring — ought but division.*) It is no valid objection to this exposition, that in 2 Cor. as above, ἀλλά itself precedes, cf. Plat. Phaed. 81 b.; see Klotz p. 36.

b) *δέ* is frequently employed when merely something new is subjoined, something other and *different* from what precedes, though not strictly something contrasted (Herm. Vig. 845); this occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 15 sq.; 1 Cor. iv. 7; xv. 35 even in a succession of questions (Hartung I. 169; Klotz, Devar. II. 356). Hence, in the first three Gospels *καί* and *δέ* are sometimes found respectively in parallel passages; in 2 Cor., however, as above, a clause commencing with *ἤ* is inserted in a series of clauses containing *δέ*.¹ Like the German *aber*, *δέ* is used in particular where an explanation is annexed, — whether as an integral part of a sentence, as in 1 Cor. ii. 6 *σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, iii. 15; Rom. iii. 22; ix. 80; Phil. ii. 8, or as a complete sentence in itself, as in Jno. vi. 10; ix. 14; xi. 5; xxi. 1; Gal. ii. 2; Eph. v. 32; Jas. i. 6 — and where, after a parenthesis or digression, the train of thought is resumed (Hm. Vig. 846 sq.; Klotz II. 376; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 141 sq.); 2 Cor. x. 2; ii. 12; v. 8; Eph. ii. 4; cf. Plat. Phaed. p. 80 d.; Xen. An. 7, 2, 18; Paus. 3, 14, 1 (*autem* Cic. off. 1, 43; Liv. 6, 1, 10). In an explanation which is at the same time a correction, such as 1 Cor. i. 16, the adversative force of the particle is still perceptible. Sometimes *δέ* introduces a climax, as in Heb. xii. 6, or indicates successive steps in the discourse, as in 2 Pet. i. 5–7. As to *δέ* in the apodosis [Acts xi. 17], see Weber, Demosth. p. 387, particularly after participles (supplying the place of the protasis) as in Col. i. 21 (Klotz II. 374), see Jacobs, Aelian. anim. I. 26 praef. *Δέ* used several times in succession in didactic discourse must be interpreted according to the requirements of each particular case, as in 1 Pet. iii. 14 sqq. (the third *δέ*, however, is dropped by Lchm.) see Wiesinger. In narration often several clauses are connected together simply by *δέ*, as in Acts viii. 1–3, 7–9.

καί... δέ (in one and the same clause), as often in the best authors (Weber, 413 Demosth. p. 220), is equivalent to *et... vero, atque etiam, and also* (Krü. 7th ed. 319 "*καί* means *also*; *δέ*, *and*"; Hartung I. 187 f. maintains the reverse), 464 Matt. xvi. 18; Heb. ix. 21; Jno. vi. 51; xv. 27; 1 Jno. i. 3; Acts xxii. 29; 2 Pet. i. 5; Schaef. Long. p. 349 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 154; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 137. The opposite phrase *δὲ καί* (2 Pet. ii. 1) means *but also*.

As to *μέν* (weakened from *μήν*²), there is nothing peculiar in N. T. usage, for *μέν... δέ... δέ* in Jude 8 (not in 2 Cor. viii. 17) requires no explanation. Where, however, *μέν... ἀλλά* correspond, as in Rom. xiv. 20 etc. (cf. Iliad 1, 22 sqq.; Xen. C. 7, 1, 16), the second clause is made more strongly prominent, Klotz, Devar. II. 3. Further, when *μέν... καί* correspond, as in Acts xxvii. 21 f., there exists an unmistakable anacoluthon, Hm. Vig. 841; Maetzner, Antiph. 257. As to *μέν* without *δέ* following, see § 63, I. 2, c. p. 575. Finally, on the unauthorized insertion of *μέν* before *δέ* (Wahl, Clav. p. 307), see Fr. Rom. II. 423, cf. Rost 731.

¹ In Greek authors, also, *δέ* occurs frequently, as is well known, in narration.

² This occurs in the N. T. only in the pure Greek combination *ἤ μήν* Heb. vi. 14 (and even there not without var.), used to introduce an oath (Hartung, II. 376, 388).

Antithesis expressed by means of *yet, however*, is of very rare occurrence in the N. T. John uses *μέντοι* most frequently where others would have employed a simple *δέ*. He once strengthens *μέντοι* by prefixing *οὐκ* (xii. 42). Elsewhere *δμως* is used but twice, — by Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 7; Gal. iii. 15. We find *καίτοιγε* in Acts xiv. 17, referring to something that 394 precedes, and meaning *although, quamquam* [cf. also Jno. iv. 2]. In the 7th ed. N. T. there is nothing peculiar in the use of *ἀλλά γε* (Luke xxiv. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 2 etc.) *but yet, but certainly*, Klotz, Devar. II. 24 sq., except that both particles are placed in immediate succession, which could scarcely occur in classic authors, Klotz, as above, p. 15. The correlation *though ... yet*, is expressed by *εἰ καί ... ἀλλά* in Col. ii. 5 *εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμὶ*, and by *εἰ καί ... γε* in Luke xviii. 4. In general, *εἰ καί* means *if also, si etiam, quamquam* (designating something as matter of fact); but *καὶ εἰ* *even if, etiam si* (putting something merely as a case supposed), cf. Hm. Vig. 832; Klotz, Devar. II. 519 sq.

8. The *temporal* relation of clauses is expressed by *ὥς, ὅτε (ὅταν), ἐπεὶ*, or by *ἕως, μέχρι, πρὶν* (§ 41 b. 3, p. 296 sq. and § 60). An *inference* is indicated by *οὖν, τοίνυν, ὥστε (μενοῦν)*, and more sharply by *ἄρα, διό (ὅθεν), τοιγαροῦν, (οὐκοῦν* only in Jno. xviii. 37). The *causal* relation is denoted by *ὅτι, γάρ (διότι, ἐπεὶ)*, while *ὥς, καθὼς, καθότι* (subjoining a clause) are rather explanatory than argumentative. Lastly, a *condition* is expressed by *εἰ (εἴγε, εἴπερ), εἰάν*, § 41 b. 2, p. 291 sq.

a. The most usual and most strictly syllogistic of the illative particles is *οὖν*, [Val. Chr. Fr. Rost üb. Ableitung, Bedeutung u. Gebrauch der 414 Partikel *οὖν*. Gött. 1859. 4to.]. Its reference can be discovered with more 7th ed. or less facility from the context in each instance, e.g. Matt. iii. 8, 10; 465 xii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 11 (see Mey. in loc.); Matt. xxvii. 22; Acts i. 21; Rom. vi. 4. But like the German *nun* (Eng. *then, now*), it is very often used to indicate the mere continuance of a narration (when what follows depends upon what precedes chronologically merely), Jno. iv. 5, 28; xiii. 6; cf. Schaeff. Plutarch. IV. 425. Moreover, like the German *also* (*therefore, thus*) or *nun* (*now*), it is used especially after a digression to resume the train of thought (Heind. Plat. Lys. p. 52; Bornem. Xen. Mem. p. 285; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 42; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 413; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 738) 1 Cor. viii. 4; xi. 20, or when a writer proceeds to explain, (even by examples) as in Rom. xii. 20. "Αρα accordingly, quae cum ita sint, rebus ita comparatis, serves, no doubt, primarily to introduce leviorē conclusionem, as it is used principally in conversation and the language of ordinary intercourse (Klotz, Devar. II. 167, 717); but in later Greek the use of this particle was extended, and individual writers, at least, employ it to indicate even a strictly logical inference. It inclines towards

its primary import when used in the apodosis (after a conditional clause) (Matt. xii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. iii. 29; Heb. xii. 8; cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 2; 8, 4, 7); so also when it expresses an inference from some singular averment (cf. 1 Cor. v. 10; xv. 15, where it may be rendered by *indeed*, *that is*, Klotz 169; cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 92; Hoogeveen, doctrina particul. I. 109 sq.) or proceeding (Luke xi. 48). In the N. T. Paul employs this particle most frequently, especially when analyzing the import of a quotation from the O. T., Rom. x. 17; Gal. iii. 7 (cf. Heb. iv. 9), or summing up a discussion, Rom. viii. 1 (Gal. iv. 31 var.); though in these cases he as often uses *οὖν*. In questions *ἄρα* refers either to an assertion or fact previously mentioned, Matt. xix. 25; Luke viii. 25; xxii. 23; Acts xii. 18; 2 Cor. i. 17, or to some thought existing in the mind of the questioner Matt. xviii. 1, and which suggests itself more or less distinctly to the 395 reader. It then signifies, *such being the case, under these circumstances*, 6th ed. rebus ita comparatis, and sometimes, *of course, obviously*, Klotz II. 176. Likewise *εἰ ἄρα σὶ forte* Mark xi. 13; Acts viii. 22 and *ἐπεὶ ἄρα* 1 Cor. vii. 14 may be referred to this signification (Klotz, as above, 178). "*Ἀρα οὖν* combined, and that as the first words of a sentence (see, on the other hand, Hm. Vig. 823), *so then, hinc ergo* (where *ἄρα* is illative and *οὖν* continuative, cf. Hoogeveen, doctr. part. I. 129 sq.; II. 1002), is a favorite expression of Paul's, Rom. v. 18; vii. 3; viii. 12; ix. 16, etc. I know of no instances of this combination in Greek authors: in Plat. rep. 5, p. 462 a. the recent texts read (in the question) *ἄρ' οὖν*, cf. Schneider in loc.; Klotz, Devar. II. 180. Paul and Luke employ *διό* (*δι' ὅ*) most frequently. *Τούτων assuredly now, therefore*, and *τοῦτο οὖν* (strengthened *τοῦτό*, Klotz II. 738) *wherefore then*, are rare. As to *ὥστε* and its construction, see p. 301.

b. *Ὅτι* refers in general to some matter of fact under consideration, and hence signifies both *that* and *because*, quod; in the latter case, it is some- 466 times rendered still more forcible by a preceding *διὰ τοῦτο* (propterea quod). 415 Occasionally it is used elliptically, Luke xi. 18 *if Satan also is divided* 7th ed. *against himself, how will his kingdom stand?* (I ask this) *because ye say, by Beelzebub* etc.; i. 25; Mark iii. 30 (Acta Apocr. p. 57); Bornem. Luc. p. 6. Likewise in Jno. ii. 18, where it amounts to the same thing to translate it *in consideration of the fact that (seeing that)*, Fr. Mt. p. 248 sq. But in Matt. v. 45 *ὅτι* simply means *because*. (Sometimes it seems doubtful whether *ὅτι* means *because* or *that*; the decision then rests on hermeneutical grounds.) The compound *διότι* (chiefly found in later Greek) *for this reason that*, or simply *because*, Fr. Rom. I. 57 sq., is used most frequently by Paul and Luke.

Γάρ is in cultivated prose the most common causal particle, and corresponds to our *for*. Originally (it is contracted from *γὰρ* and *ἄρα*, *ἄρ*), it expresses in general a corroboration or assent (*γὰρ*) in reference to what precedes (*ἄρα*!) (see Hartung I. 457 ff.; Schneider, Vorles. I. 219; Klotz,

Devar. II. 232 f.¹): *sane igitur, certe igitur, sane pro rebus comparatis* (*enim* in its primary import), and from this fundamental signification arose its causal force. In consequence of its original signification γάρ serves—passing over what is familiar—first of all and very naturally

a) to introduce explanatory clauses, whether they appear in the form of supplementary statements (sometimes of digressions) Mark v. 42; xvi. 4; 1 Cor. xvi. 5; Rom. vii. 1, or blend with the current of the discourse 2 Cor. iv. 11; Rom. vii. 2; Jas. i. 24; ii. 2; Heb. ix. 2; Gal. ii. 12. Γάρ is then to be rendered by *that is*, Klotz 234 sq. Explanatory in a wide sense every confirmation or proof (even Heb. ii. 8) may be said to be which we introduce by *for* (though the German *ja* comes nearer than *denn* to the primary import of γάρ Hartung I. 463 ff.): Matt. ii. 20 *go into the land of Israel; for they are dead etc.* This is especially the case in those passages where it was supposed that something is to be supplied before γάρ *for*,²
 396 Matt. ii. 2: where is the born king of the Jews? (he that is born king of
 467 the Jews?) for we have seen his star, xxii. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 5;
 Phil. iii. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 5. Hence what Klotz says p. 240
 is in point: Nihil supplendum est ante enuntiationem eam, quae inferitur
 per partic. γάρ, sed ut omnis constet oratio, *postea demum* aliquid tacita
 cogitatione adsumendum erit, sed nihil tamen alieni, verum id ipsum, quod
 ea sententia quae praecedit γάρ particulae enuntiavit (for we have seen his
 star, — he must have been born, therefore, somewhere). Likewise,
 467 b) in replies and rejoinders (Klotz p. 240 sq.) the original import of
 416 γάρ is prominent; for in Jno. ix. 30 *ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν etc.* the
 7th ed. reply refers primarily to the statement of the Pharisees in vs. 29 (*ἄρα*),
 and then subjoins an affirmation (γε): *sane quidem mirum est etc. in*
this at least, it is assuredly wonderful. So also in 1 Cor. viii. 11; ix. 9, 10;
 xiv. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 20, in all which cases nothing is to be supplied before
 γάρ.³ Equally unnecessary is it to supply anything in *exhortations* (Klotz
 242) Jas. i. 7: *for* let not that man think etc.; here *ἄρα* refers back to ὁ
 γὰρ διακρινόμενος etc., and γε combines a corroboration with the inference.
 On the other hand,

¹ Si sequimur originem ipsam ac naturam particulae γάρ, hoc dicitur conjunctis istis particulis: *Sane pro rebus comparatis*, ac primum adfirmatur res pro potestate particulae γε, deinde refertur eadem ad antecedentia per vim particulae ἄρα.

² This practice of supplying something has been carried to an extent quite pedantic, e.g. Matt. iv. 18; xxvi. 11; Mark iv. 25; v. 42; 2 Cor. ix. 7. If it were maintained that between the propositions, "He makes clothes, for he is a tailor," we must supply, "One need not wonder at this," every body would regard it as ridiculous. As to the Latin *nam*, see *Hand*, Tursell. IV. 12 sqq.

³ In Acts xvi. 37 Παῦλος ἔφη· δειραντες ἡμᾶς δημοσίᾳ ἀκατακρίτους, ἀνθρώπους Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας ἐβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν, καὶ νῦν λάθρᾳ ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλουσιν; Paul immediately answers the question himself, οὐ γὰρ, ἀλλὰ . . . αὐτοὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξαγαγέτωσαν: non sane pro rebus comparatis. The ἄρα contained in γάρ glances back at the circumstances previously described; while the γε founds upon them a corroboration: continet (as Klotz says p. 242) cum affirmatione conclusionem, quae ex rebus ita comparatis facienda sit.

c) in *questions* γάρ seems to deviate farthest from its original import. And in fact the origin of this use may have been afterwards forgotten, and γάρ have been regarded as the sign of a question¹ urgent because justified by the connection (Klotz 247). However, the essentially inferential force of γάρ (ἀρα!) is still perceptible in many passages: igitur rebus ita comparatis, adeo. In Matt. xxvii. 23 Pilate's question τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν; refers to the demand of the Jews σταυρωθῆτω in vs. 22. From this Pilate infers the opinion which he in the question imputes to the Jews: quid igitur (since you demand his crucifixion) putatis eum mali fecisse? So in Jno. vii. 41 (surely you do not think then that the Messiah comes out of Galilee? num igitur putatis, Messiam etc.?) The reference of this γάρ to something preceding is in all cases plain;—even in Acts xix. 35; viii. 31. It is usual in this case also to supply something before the question, even though only a *nescio* or *miror*, Hm. Vig. 829 and ad Aristoph. nub. 192; Wahl, Clav. 79 sq. See in opposition, Klotz 234, 247. Lastly, Klotz 236, 238 appears to be right in contradicting the 397 current assertion, that even in prose authors (such as Her. see Kühner 6th ed. II. 453) it is not unusual, in the lively movement of thought, to put γάρ with the causal clause before the clause it is intended to substantiate (see Matthiae, Eurip. Phoen. p. 371; Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 207; Rost, Gr. 738²); in reference to the N. T. (Fr. 2 diss. in 2 Cor. p. 18 sq.; Tholuck 468 on Jno. iv. 44 and Heb. ii. 8) this observation was in fact unnecessary. Meyer has, beyond doubt, correctly explained Jno. iv. 44. In Heb. ii. 8 the words ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξει τὰ πάντα contain the proof of there being nothing which was not put in subjection to him according to God's purpose, 417 indirectly therefore of vs. 5 that the world to come also is put in subjection 7th ed. to him; while νῦν δὲ οὕτω etc. shows that this subjection has at least begun to be carried into effect. The Scriptural promise must be distinguished from its actual fulfilment, which, however, has already commenced. 2 Cor. ix. 1 stands in obvious connection with viii. 24. 1 Cor. iv. 4 οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνακρίνω· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σίνουδα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι is to be translated: *I am conscious, to be sure, to myself of nothing, yet etc.*

d) γάρ occurs several times in succession with change of reference: Rom. ii. 11–14; iv. 13–15; v. 6, 7; viii. 5 f.; x. 2–5; xvi. 18 f.; Jas. i. 6, 7; ii. 10; iv. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 3–5; ix. 16 f.; Heb. vii. 12–14 (Lycurg. 24, 1; 32, 3) see Engelhardt, Plat. Apol. p. 225; Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. 183 sq. In such passages γάρ often gives the ground of a series of separate thoughts subordinate one to another (Jas. i. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 8; Rom. viii. 5 ff.),

¹ The energy which resides in such questions with γάρ proceeds from their being prompted by the very words of the other party, or by the circumstances; a right being thus conferred to demand an answer, e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 22.

² Hm. Eurip. Iphig. Taur. p. 70: saepe in ratione reddenda invertunt Graeci ordinem sententiarum, caussam praemittentes: quo genere loquendi saepissime usus est Herodotus. Cf. also Hoogeveen I. 252.

see Fr. Rom. II. 111. Sometimes, however, the same words are repeated with γάρ in order to introduce some addition to what has been said, Rom. xv. 27 (not 2 Cor. v. 4).

Kαὶ γάρ is equivalent either to *etenim* (merely connecting) or *nam etiam* (giving prominence) Klotz, Devar. II. 642 sq. This latter signification has frequently been overlooked by expositors, even those of the N. T. (Weber, Demosth. p. 271; Fr. Rom. II. p. 433). Thus in Jno. iv. 23; Acts xix. 40; Rom. xi. 1; xv. 3; xvi. 2; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. ii. 10, etc.; in several of these passages even Wahl renders καὶ γάρ by *etenim*. Τε γάρ in Rom. vii. 7 means *for also*, or *for indeed*, Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 176; Schaef. Dem. II. 579 and Plutarch. IV. 324; Klotz, Devar. II. 749 sqq.; but in Heb. ii. 11 (Rom. i. 26) τε and καί correspond, and in 2 Cor. x. 8 there is probably an anacoluthon, Klotz l.c. 749.

Ἐπεὶ passed from a particle of *time* into a causal particle, like our *since* and the Latin *quando*. Ἐπειδή answers entirely to *quoniam* (from quom — quum — jam). Ἐπειπερ *since indeed* (Hm. Vig. 786) occurs only in Rom. iii. 30 (yet not without var.), see Fr. in loc. [Ἐπειδήπερ *forasmuch as, since now* (Aristot. Phys. 8, 5; Dion. Hal. 2, 72; Philo ad Caj. § 25 and used by the best Greek authors, see Hartung, Partikell. I. S. 342 sq.) occurs in the N. T. only in Luke i. 1.]

Καθώς and ὥς, in appended clauses, denote explanation rather than strict confirmation, and resemble the Latin (*quoniam*) *quippe, siquidem*, and the antiquated (Germ.) *sintemal*. On ὥς (in 2 Tim. i. 3; Gal. vi. 10; Matt. vi. 12 it means *as*) cf. Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 336; Stallb. Plat. sympos. p. 135; Lehmann, Lucian. I. 457; III. 425 etc.

398 As to ἐφ' ᾧ *on this account that*, see p. 394.

6th ed. c. Εἰ has the compound forms εἴτε if that is *since, quandoquidem* (when no
469 doubt exists) and εἴπερ if *indeed* (when no decision is implied), Hm. Vig. p. 834; cf. Klotz. Devar. II. 308, 528, which occur almost exclusively in Paul. The distinction pointed out is obvious in most passages; as to Eph. iii. 2, see Mey. 1 Pet. ii. 3, and probably also 2 Thess. i. 6, appears to be of a
418 rhetorical nature. On these passages, as well as Rom. viii. 9; Col. i. 23,
7th ed. see Fr. Prälimin. S. 67 f. Εἰ itself retains the signification *if*, even where in point of meaning it stands for ἐπεὶ *since* (Acts iv. 9; Rom. xi. 21; 1 Jno. iv. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 4, etc.); the sentence is in form conditional: *if* (as is actually the case), and the categoric force for the moment does not come into view. Sometimes there is a rhetorical reason for this usage (Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 195; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 101). So also in expressions in which it may be rendered by *that*, see § 60, 6. Εἰ denoting a wish, *if only, O that*, for which Greek authors usually employ εἴθε or εἰ γάρ (Klotz. Devar. II. 516), occurs, according to the punctuation adopted by recent editors, in Luke xii. 49 καὶ τί θέλω; εἰ ἤδη ἀνίφθῃ and *what do I wish?* (answer) *if it were* (only) *already kindled*; see Mey. [in his earlier eds.] in loc. With regard to the Aorist, see Klotz l.c.: si de aliqua

re sermo est, de qua, quum non facta sit olim, nunc nobis gratum fore significamus, si facta esset illo tempore. Such a question, however, seems rather artificial in the mouth of Jesus. Of the objections which Mey. brings against the common exposition, *How I wish that it were already kindled!* the second, so far as usage goes, is less forcible than the first. [But Mey. now (4th ed.) acknowledges the common interpretation to be correct.]

9. *Final* clauses are expressed by means of the conjunctions *ἵνα*, *ὥς* (ὡς). *Objective* clauses,¹ which as they express the object of the principal clause in the form of a perception or judgment merely unfold its predicate, and consequently assume the place of the Objective case in a simple sentence (Thiersch, gr. Grammat. S. 605), *I see that this is good, I say that he is rich*, are introduced by *ὅτι* or *ὥς*. Yet conjunctions are the less indispensable for both kinds of clauses as both may be conveniently expressed by means of the Infinitive, § 44.

**ὅτι* is the proper objective particle, like *quod* and *that*. It is used in this sense e.g. also after solemn asseverations, as in 2 Cor. xi. 10 *ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοί*, Gal. i. 20 *ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, 2 Cor. i. 18 *πιστὸς ὁ θεός*, Rom. xiv. 11, for these include the idea *I aver*, cf. Fr. Rom. II. 242 sq. In this way, too, is *ὅτι* to be taken when it introduces direct discourse, Mdv. p. 222; cf. Weber, Demosth. p. 346.

**ὥς* (Adv. from the pronoun *ὅς* Klotz, Devar. II. 757) likewise signifies, after verbs of *knowing, saying* etc., *how, ut* (Klotz p. 765) Acts x. 28 470 *ἐπίστασθε, ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ* *ye know, how (that) it is unlawful for a Jew*. Thus the two conjunctions *ὅτι* and *ὥς*, when used in objective sentences, proceed from different conceptions of the object, but coincide in sense.

**Ὅπως*, like *ut* (quo), besides being an adverb (*how, πῶς* Klotz, Devar. II. 681, cf. Luke xxiv. 20), has become a conjunction. **ἵνα* was originally a relative adverb, *where, whither* (Klotz, as above, p. 616). From local direction it was transferred to direction of the will (design), and thus resembles the Latin *quo*. In the N. T. *ὥς* expressing design (Klotz p. 760) occurs only in the well-known phrase *ὥς ἔπος εἰπῶν*, Heb. vii. 9; cf. Mtth. 1265, which, however, recent grammarians are inclined to explain otherwise, Klotz II. 765; Madv. 164. (How *ἵνα* in the N. T. is used also instead of the simple Inf., see p. 334 sqq.)

10. The regular use of all these conjunctions, framed as they were to express the several relations of clauses, would be quite annulled, had the N. T. writers actually employed one conjunction

¹ Weller, über Subjects . . . und Objectsätze etc. Meining. 1845. 4to.

for another — if with them $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ often were equivalent to $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ to $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$, $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ to $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\tau\epsilon$, etc.¹ — as expositors, following indeed the scholiasts (Fischer ad Palaeoph. p. 6) and earlier philologists, long assumed (Pott, Heinrichs, Flatt, Kühnöl, Schott, even D. Schulz), and as the Hermeneutics of the time (Keil, Hermen. S. 67) taught.

- 471 But such interchange is in every instance only apparent. It rests in part on the circumstance, that the relation of two sentences to each other may be conceived sometimes in several ways²; and thus the particular logical connection in a given passage may depend on the conception of the individual (or nation, see below on $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$), one which is unfamiliar to the reader; and in part on a
 400 conciseness of expression foreign to the genius of our language.
 4th ed. Wherever the apostles use a $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ they have always thought somehow of a *but*; and it is the expositor's duty to reproduce for himself in
 420 like manner the connection of thought, and not for convenience'
 1st ed. sake to imagine an interchange of conjunctions perhaps of opposite import. For how absurd to suppose that the apostles actually used *for* when they intended to say *but*, or *but* when they should have written *for*! Any child can distinguish such relations. And how stupid they must have been to think of employing instead of *for* its opposite *therefore*! None but expositors who had never accustomed themselves to view language as *living* speech, or who shrank from the labor of precise thought, could have indulged such an

¹ Even the better expositors are not free from this arbitrariness: thus Beza in 1 Cor. viii. 7 takes $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ for *itaque*. See in opposition to such interpretation my Progr. Conjunctionum in N. T. accuratius explicandar. caussae et exempla. Erlang. 1826. 4to. It is really strange to see how the commentaries (till within a few decades) undertake again and again to dictate to the apostles, and force upon them almost always some other conjunction than that actually employed in the text. Were we to reckon up the passages, there would certainly remain e.g. in Paul's epistles not more than six or eight in which the apostle has selected the *right* particle, and not required the subsequent aid of an expositor. This has made the interpretation of the N. T. very arbitrary. Are we not to believe that Paul and Luke knew more Greek than many of their domineering expositors? No one in this matter can appeal to the Hebrew who has not a most irrational idea of that language. Such arbitrary substitutions of one thing for another are impossible in any human speech. Besides, the arbitrariness of the interpreters was the more manifest, because different expositors often attributed to a conjunction senses entirely different in the same passage: (in 2 Cor. viii. 7 e.g. $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ according to some is put for $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$; according to others, for $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ etc.; in Heb. v. 11 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ according to some is put for $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, but according to others means *licet*. In Heb. iii. 10 Kühnöl leaves it optional whether $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is taken for $\kappa\alpha\iota$ or in the sense of *nam*). Thus purely private opinion has here the freest range. Moreover, the translators of the books of the N. T. (even the excellent Schulz in the Epistle to the Hebrews) deserve censure for rendering the conjunctions most capriciously.

² Cf., as to such a case, Klotz II. p. 5, and the remarks made below (after explaining $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$), p. 455 sq.

imagination; and it is no honor to biblical exegesis that such principles so long found approval. In human thought connected ideas are always related ideas. Whenever, therefore, a conjunction is used in a sense apparently foreign to it, the very first endeavor must be to show the *process* by which the writer's mind passed from the primary to the unusual signification. But this was not thought of; had serious thought been given to it, the delusion of which we have been speaking would have vanished in a moment.

As the unlimited interchange of conjunctions is a pure fiction, so too is the notion that they are *weakened*; according to which even the more forcible particles, as *for*, *but*, are represented as being quite superfluous or mere particles of transition (see e.g. no. 3 below). Recent exegetes, indeed, have abandoned this 472 arbitrary but convenient rule of interpretation. We will therefore single out only a few especially specious passages, in which the conjunctions employed were for a long time not acquiesced in, or where even the better expositors are not agreed about the connection of thought.

1. Ἀλλά does not stand

a) for οὖν: In 2 Cor. viii. 7 ἀλλά simply means *but*, *at*: from Titus, to whom he had given instructions, Paul turns to exhort his readers on their part to do what was desired; for the clause with ἵνα is to be taken imperatively. Eph. v. 24 is not an inference from vs. 23; but the statement in vs. 22, that wives should be subject to their husbands ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, is proved in vs. 23, 24 first from the *position* of Christ and of the husband, both being κεφαλαί, *but* secondly — and this is the main argument — from the *claim* (to be obeyed) which, as for Christ so for the husband, flows from this position. And vs. 24, so far from being a mere repetition of what is stated in vs. 22, concludes the argument, and explains ὑποτάσσ. τοῖς ἀνδρ. ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ. The expressive apposition also, αὐτὸς σωτήρ etc., does not interrupt the train of thought; whereas the exposition of Mey., who regards these words as an independent sentence, introduces a statement that obstructs the line of argument. As to Acts x. 20 (Elsner in loc.), see above, no. 7. p. 442.

b) for εἰ μὴ: In Mark ix. 8 οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον 421 means, they *no longer* saw any one (of those that they had *previously* 7th ed. seen, vs. 4), but (they saw) Jesus alone. In Matt. xx. 23 (Raphel and 401 Alberti in loc.) δοθήσεται, borrowed from δοῦναι, is to be repeated after 6th ed. ἀλλά, and the conjunction signifies *but*.

c) for *sane*, *profecto*: neither in Jno. viii. 26 see no. 7 p. 442, nor in xvi. 2, where it denotes *imo* or *at* as in Acts xix. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 6. Rom. vi. 5, where ἀλλά (καί) occurs in the apodosis, does not come under this head.

2. Δέ never means

a) *therefore, then* : In 1 Cor. xi. 28 it signifies *but*, in antithesis to vs. 27 ἀναζήτως ἐσθίειν, *but let a man examine himself* (in order to avoid bringing on himself such guilt). In 1 Cor. viii. 9 a practical restriction, in the form of an admonition, is annexed to the general principle laid down in vs. 8 : *but* see to it that this liberty do not become etc. In Rom. viii. 8, if Paul had intended to present θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται as an inference from what precedes he might have continued with *therefore* (as Rück. explains δέ); but he passes from ἐχθρα εἰς θεόν to the other aspect of the matter θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται, — a transition which would have surprised no one had there been no parenthetical clause. In Jas. ii. 15 δέ, if genuine, means *jam vero, atqui*.

b) *for* (Poppo, Thuc. II. 291; Ind. ad Xen. Cyr., and Bornem. ind. ad Xen. Anab.; see, on the other hand, Hm. Vig. 846; Schaef. Demosth. II. 128 sq.; V. 541; Lehm. Lucian. I. 197; Wex, Antig. I. 300 sq.):¹ In Mark xvi. 8 εἶχε δέ is merely explanatory, the cause of this τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις is stated in the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ; some good Codd., however, which Lchm. follows, [Sin. also] have γάρ in the first passage. In Jno. vi. 10 the words ἦν δὲ χάρις etc. are also a supplementary explanation; see above. In 1 Thess. ii. 16 ἔφθασε δέ forms a contrast to the intention of the Jews ἀναπληρ. αὐτῶν τ. ἁμαρτ. : *but* (as, in fact, they would have it so) *the punishment for this is come on them*. In Matt. xxiii. 5 πλατύνουσι δέ etc. are special illustrations of πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσι πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι; the γάρ, adopted by the more recent editors, probably owes its origin to scribes who were troubled by δέ. In 1 Tim. iii. 5 εἰ δέ τις etc. means, *but if one* etc.; the sentence, as will be seen by referring to vs. 6, is a parenthetical antithesis to τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προϊστάμενον. In 1 Cor. iv. 7 *who distinguisheth thee* (declares thee pre-eminent)? *but what hast thou, that thou didst not receive?* i.e. *but if thou appealest to the pre-eminence which thou possessest, I ask thee, hast thou not received it?* In 1 Cor. vii. 7 (Flatt, Schott) δέ signifies *potius*. In 1 Cor. x. 11 ἐγγράφη δέ, as even the leading position of the verb indicates, forms an antithesis to the statement that precedes: all these things happened etc.; *but they were written* etc. In 1 Cor. xv. 13 δέ is a genuine adversative: if Christ is risen, then the resurrection of the dead is a reality; *but* if the resurrection of the dead is not a reality, then (by converse reasoning) neither is Christ risen. Verse 14 contains a further inference: *but* if Christ is not risen, then etc. The one statement of necessity establishes or invalidates the other. In 2 Pet. i. 13 δέ forms the antithesis to the words καίπερ εἰδότας etc. On Phil. iv. 18 see Mey.

¹ In the sense of *namely, that is*, both conjunctions coincide: by means of δέ a new clause is annexed which is part of the statement; while by means of γάρ a clause is presented as a confirmatory illustration of what precedes. The latter mode of expression is often in substance equivalent to the former; see Hm. Vig. p. 845.

c) Nor does it ever serve as a mere copula or particle of transition : Matt. xxi. 3 (Schott) *say, the Lord hath need of them ; and straightway he will send them*, i.e. these words will not be without effect ; *but*, on the contrary, he will straightway etc. In Acts xxiv. 17 the narration proceeds by means of *δέ* to another event. In 1 Cor. xiv. 1 *δέ* means *but* : *but* the *διώκειν τὴν ἀγάπην* must not prevent you from *ζηλοῦν τὰ πν.* On 2 Cor. ii. 12 Meyer's opinion is more correct than de Wette's ; Paul refers to vs. 4. In 1 Cor. xi. 2 it would be a mistake to regard, as Rück. does, *δέ* as indicating merely the advance to a new topic (Luther has not translated it at all, while Schott renders it by *quidem*) ; the words connect themselves (directly) with the exhortation immediately preceding, *μνηταί μου γίνεσθε* : 474 *yet* (while I thus urge you, I do not mean to blame you) *I praise you* etc. Likewise in Rom. iv. 3 Luther and many other translators have neglected *δέ* (at the beginning of a quotation where the Sept. has *καί*) ; but Paul is probably as little chargeable as James (ii. 23) with having used the adversative particle wantonly or without meaning. It renders *ἐπίστευσε* more forcible, not to say almost antithetic.

3. *Γάρ* is incorrectly taken

a) for the adversative *but* (Markland, Eur. suppl. vs. 8 ; Elmsley, Eur. Med. 121 ; see, on the other hand, Hm. Vig. 846 ; Bremi in the n. krit. Journ. IX. 533) : In 2 Cor. xii. 20 *I say all that for your edification ; for I fear* etc. (this is the very reason that I say it). In Rom. iv. 13 the clause with *γάρ* confirms the last words of the preceding verse, *ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς* etc. In Rom. v. 6 f. the first *γάρ* simply refers to the fact which attested the love of God (vs. 5), — Christ's dying for the ungodly ; the second *γάρ* explains, a *contrario*, how death (of the innocent) for the guilty evinces transcendent love ; the third *γάρ* substantiates the remark *μόλις ὑπὲρ δικαίου* etc. 1 Cor. v. 3 means : and ye, have ye not felt yourselves compelled to exclude the man ? *for I* (for my part), *absent in body, ... have already decided* etc. It was, therefore, surely to be expected that ye, who have him before your eyes, would have applied the (milder) punishment of exclusion. Pott understands *γάρ* here in the sense of *alias* ! As to 1 Cor. iv. 9 see above, p. 446 a). 2 Cor. xii. 6 is : *of myself I will not boast ; for if I should desire to boast, I shall not be a fool* (therefore, I might do so). In Phil. iii. 20 *ἡμῶν γάρ* etc. stands in closest relation to *οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρον.* *they that mind earthly things !* (a summary of vs. 19), *for our* conversation is in heaven (on this very account I warn you against them, vs. 18 f.). In Rom. viii. 6 the clause with *γάρ* states the reason why *οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα* (vs. 4) *τὰ τοῦ πν. φρονούσω*, which is, that the *φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός* leads to death, but the *φρόν. τοῦ πν.* to life ; vs. 5, 423 however, is confirmatory of vs. 4. In Col. ii. 1 Bengel had already indicated the correct interpretation. Heb. vii. 12 (Kühnöl : *autem*) appends the reason for vs. 11 : *for* change in the priestly succession and abolition of the law necessarily go together, see Bleek in loc. 2 Pet. iii. 5 explains 7th ed.

(Pott) how such men can come forward with such frivolous assertions as 403 in vs. 3, 4. Heb. xii. 3 enforces the preceding resolution *τρέχωμεν* etc., by 6th ed. reference to the example of Christ.

b) for *therefore, then*: Bengel's remark throws light on Luke xii. 58: *γάρ* saepe ponitur, ubi propositionem excipit tractatio. 1 Cor. xi. 26 elucidates the expression *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* vs. 25. In Rom. ii. 28 475 the connection is this: the uncircumcised, who lives agreeably to the law, may convict thee, who, though circumcised, transgressest the law; *for* it is not what is external (like circumcision) *that constitutes the real Jew*. On Heb. ii. 8 see above, p. 447.

c) for *although*: as in Jno. iv. 44 (see Kühnöl); but *γάρ* is simply *for*; *παρὶς* can only mean Galilee, vs. 43.

d) for *on the contrary*: 2 Pet. i. 9 (Augusti). *Δέ* might have been used, if the apostle had intended to say: *but he, on the contrary, who lacks these* (virtues) etc. With *γάρ*, the sentence confirms (illustrates) the foregoing *οὐκ ἀργούς . . . Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν* a contrario (*μή*): *for he that lacks these*, is blind. This interpretation supplies, too, a more forcible reason for the exhortation in vs. 10.

e) for *ἀλλ' ὁμως nevertheless*: 2 Cor. xii. 1 (where indeed the reading is extremely uncertain; yet the common reading *δὴ* is not so decidedly incorrect as Mey. insists) *to boast* (xi. 22 ff.) *is not expedient for me surely; for I will* (*I will, that is to say*, Klotz, Devar. II. 235) *now come to visions and revelations of the Lord*. Paul in this passage contrasts (cf. vs. 5) *boasting of himself* (of his own merits) with boasting of the divine marks of distinction accorded him. Of these last he will boast, vs. 5. Accordingly, the meaning is: *yet glorying in self is not expedient; for now will I come to a subject for glorying that excludes all self-glorification and renders it superfluous*.

f) for the mere copula: In Rom. iii. 2 *πρῶτον μὲν γάρ* commences the proof of the statement *πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον*. Acts ix. 11 *inquire in the house of Judas for Saul of Tarsus; for, behold, he prayeth* (thou wilt therefore find him there), *and he hath seen a vision* (which has prepared him to receive thee), cf. Bengel in loc. In Acts xvii. 28 *τοῦ γὰρ γένους* etc. is a verse quoted verbatim from Aratus, where, moreover, *γάρ* may be taken as confirmatory of *ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν*. In Acts iv. 12 the clause *οὐδὲ γὰρ ὀνομά ἐστιν* etc. serves to unfold, and thus to establish, the statement *ἐν ἅλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία*; and what the second clause adds to the first the attentive reader will easily perceive. In Acts xiii. 27 we may, with Bengel, Meyer, and others, restore the connection thus: *to you, ye (foreign) Jews etc. is this word of salvation addressed; for those at Jerusalem have despised this Saviour*. It is more probable, 424 however, that Paul intended to proceed thus: *for* he is proved to be the 11th ed. Messiah foretold to our fathers, cf. vs. 29, 32 ff. The recital of the facts in which the prophecies were fulfilled, impairs, however, the formal com-

pactness of the reasoning. At all events γάρ is not a mere particle of transition, as Kühnöl asserts. In 2 Cor. iii. 9 it appears to me that the words εἰ γὰρ ἡ διακ. etc. go so far towards establishing the apostle's thought as διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης expresses something more definite than διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος: *if the ministration of death was glorious, ... how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be much more glorious?* Fr.'s exposition, in his diss. Corinth. I. p. 18 sq., seems to me artificial. In Matt. i. 18 404 (Schott), after the words τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χρ. ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν, the details ^{ὅτι} commence as is not unusual with γάρ *namely*.

4. Οὖν is falsely taken

a) for *but*: Acts ii. 30 (Kühnöl) προφ. οὖν ὑπάρχ. is simply an inference from the sentence that precedes: David died and was buried. He *therefore*, in his character of prophet, referred to Christ's resurrection in the words which he used apparently in reference to himself. Acts xxvi. 22 is not antithetic to vs. 21; but Paul, reviewing his apostolic life up to this imprisonment, concludes: *by the help of God, therefore, I continue until this day*, etc. Even Kühnöl, in his Comment. p. 805, accurately renders οὖν by *igitur*; but in the index οὖν is represented as here denoting *sed, tamen!* In Matt. xxvii. 22 τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν is: *what then shall I do with Jesus* (since you have decided in favor of Barabbas)?

b) for *for*. In Matt. x. 32 πᾶς οὖν ὅστις is not confirmatory of the clause πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε ὑμεῖς, but resumes and continues the main thought vs. 27 κηρύξατε etc. καὶ μὴ φοβείσθε. Fr. is of a different opinion. In the parallel passage, Luke xii. 8 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν· πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ etc., the δέ is substantially the same in sense but more expressive. In 1 Cor. iii. 5 τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ... Ἀπολλῶς; *who, then* (to follow out your party-strifes), is ... *Apollon*? In 1 Cor. vii. 26 οὖν introduces the γνώμη which the apostle proposes in vs. 25 to give.

c) for a mere copula, or as wholly superfluous: Rom. xv. 17 (Köllner) becomes at once plain by a reference to vs. 15, 16 (διὰ τὴν χάριν etc.). The οὖν in Matt. v. 23 is entirely overlooked even by Schott; but it unquestionably introduces, however, a practical inference (admonition) from vs. 22 (the punishableness of anger etc.). It is more difficult to determine the connection in Matt. vii. 12, and even the more recent expositors differ widely from each other. Tholuck's exposition is probably correct, though his review of the various interpretations is far from complete. In Jno. viii. 38 καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ποιεῖτε the οὖν is far from being redundant; it contrasts with sad irony the conduct of the Jews (*you also, therefore*) with the conduct of Jesus, representing both as following the same principle.

Of the preceding *four* conjunctions δέ and οὖν are the most closely allied; and hence there are passages where either might have been employed with equal propriety (e.g. Matt. xviii. 31), though even in the mere continuation of discourse (in narration) they are not strictly equiv-

477 alent. Instead of: *Jesus found two fishermen, who . . . And (but) he said*
 425 *to them* etc., I can also say: *Jesus found . . . So (then) he said to them.*

7th ed. The change does not greatly affect the sense, but still there is a difference of conception between the two. In the first case, to the coming and finding them the speaking is annexed as something new and different; in the last, the thought is this: *he said then* (availing himself of the opportunity) *to them*. If in such an instance the narrator employs $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, it cannot be asserted that he ought to have used $\sigma\upsilon\nu$; or vice versa. $\Gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, also, can sometimes be used with equal propriety (see 10, 2, b) p. 452): In Jno. vi. 10 the evangelist wrote: *Jesus said, make the people recline; now (but) there was much grass in the place. He might also have written: for there was much grass, etc.* In the latter case he represents the circum-

405 stance as the incidental cause of the direction; in the former, it is given
 6th ed. as merely explanatory; see Klotz II. 362; cf. Hm. Vig. 845 sq. Here also then there is a difference of conception in the two cases. Consequently we may not adduce parallel passages, such as Luke xiii. 35, cf. Matt. xxiii. 39, as proof of the perfect equality of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$. Even, however, if in such cases $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\sigma\upsilon\nu$, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, are pretty nearly equivalent, it does not follow that they are interchangeable in all, even their more precise, significations. On the other hand, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ are particles of far too definitive a nature to admit of their being used for each other at will, or even being unimportant. Finally, even in the most ancient Codd. (and versions¹) numerous variations are found, in respect to the conjunctions $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ Matt. xxiii. 5; Mark v. 42; xii. 2; xiv. 2; Luke x. 42; xii. 30; xx. 40; Jno. ix. 11; xi. 30, etc.; Rom. iv. 15 (Fr. Rom. II. 476), $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ Luke x. 37; xiii. 18; xv. 28; Jno. vi. 3; ix. 26; x. 20; xii. 44; xix. 16; Acts xxviii. 9 etc., $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ and $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ Acts xxv. 11; Rom. iii. 28.

5. $\sigma\tau\iota$ is not equivalent

a) to $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ *wherefore* (as the Hebrew מֵכַן , but likewise erroneously, is sometimes rendered; see my Simonis under the word, yet see Passow
 478 under $\sigma\tau\iota$): In Luke vii. 47 nothing but a blind hostility to the Catholics (see Grotius and Calov. in loc.) could misinterpret $\sigma\tau\iota$, see Mey. in loc. As to 2 Cor. xi. 10 see above, no. 9 p. 449.

Nor is this particle used for $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\iota$ in direct question (Palairët, observ. 125; Alberti, observ. 151; Krebs, observ. 50; Griesbach, commentar. crit. II. 138; Schweigh. lexic. Herod. II. 161 [Bttm. Gramm. des N. T.

¹ These latter, therefore, where conjunctions are concerned, ought not to be cited in a critical apparatus as authorities without great caution. Yet in general, nothing has been treated so negligently by the earlier critics as the ancient versions; even the better known and most accessible are, ten to one, brought forward incorrectly, — when, that is to say, either from the nature of the language or the principles on which they were executed they can be made to furnish no evidence respecting a various reading. But it is to be regretted that even in the most recent editions this part of the critical apparatus still appears unsifted.

Sprachgebr. S. 218]) in Mark ix. 11; even de Wette so understands it, and in support of his opinion refers to the passages which Krebs adduces from Josephus, not considering that there $\delta\tau\iota$ ($\delta\tau\iota$, as Lchm. printed it) is used as a pronoun in an indirect question, — a usage that assuredly does not require proofs from Josephus (Kypke I. 178). But as to this passage, 426 see above, p. 167. Fr. was disposed on very slight authority to read $\tau\iota$ ^{7th ed.} $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ (from Matt.), which is undoubtedly a correction. In Mark ix. 28 the best Codd. (even the Alex. [but not Sin.]) give $\delta\alpha\ \tau\epsilon$, as in Matt. xvii. 19. In Mark ii. 16 Cod. D at least gives the same [likewise Cod. Sin.], yet Lachm. reads $\tau\iota\ \sigma\tau\iota$. But $\sigma\tau\iota$, though admitted as the true reading, would not necessarily be an interrogative. As to Jno. viii. 25 (Lücke), see § 54, 1 p. 464.

b) to *quonquam*: Kühnöl renders Luke xi. 48 *though* they killed them, yet ye etc. Beza had already given the right exposition of the passage. In Matt. xi. 25 Kühnöl has himself, in the fourth edition, given up this interpretation; and in his third edition also explains correctly Jno. viii. 45.

c) to $\sigma\tau\epsilon$. As to 1 Jno. iii. 14, see BCrus. In 1 Cor. iii. 13 (Pott) $\sigma\tau\iota$ obviously specifies why $\eta\ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \delta\eta\lambda\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota$ etc. Everybody is aware that $\sigma\tau\iota$ and $\sigma\tau\epsilon$ have often been interchanged by the transcribers (cf. Jno. xii. 41; 1 Cor. xii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 20, etc.); see Schaef. Greg. Cor. p. 491; Schneider, Plat. rep. I. 393; Siebelis, ind. Pausan. p. 259. Accordingly in the Sept. wherever $\sigma\tau\iota$ appears to have the meaning of *when* or *as*, we must un- 406 hesitatingly read $\sigma\tau\epsilon$ (even in 1 Kings viii. 37), as the recent editions give ^{6th ed.} on good manuscript authority in all the passages quoted by Pott on 1 Cor. as above.

d) to *profecto*: In Matt. xxvi. 74 $\sigma\tau\iota$ is recitative; on the other hand, in 2 Cor. xi. 10 it means *that* (as after solemn oaths), see above, no. 9 p. 449. In Rom. xiv. 11 (from Isa. xlv. 23) the sense is: *I swear by my life, that* etc.

Lastly, for a refutation of the assertion that $\sigma\tau\iota$ is equivalent to $\sigma\varsigma$, as according to some is the case in Matt. v. 45, see Fr. in loc. Vs. 45 declares that by $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ etc. they will become children of their Father in heaven, and proves this from that Father's treatment of the $\pi\omicron\tau\eta\rho\omicron\iota$.

6. *ἵνα* to the end that, in order that (sometimes preceded by a preparatory $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$, Jno. xviii. 37; Acts ix. 21; Rom. xiv. 9, etc.), is said to be 479 frequently employed in the N. T. $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\beta\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$ to denote the actual *consequence* (Glass. ed. Dathe I. 539 sqq.), as it has sometimes been taken in Greek authors also, see Hoogeveen, doct. particul. I. 524 sq., the annotations on Lucian. Nigr. 30; Weiske, Xen. Anab. 7, 3, 28; cf. also Ewald, Apocal. p. 233. Now even if this were possible as a general principle, inasmuch as the Latin *ut* denotes both design and result (though the gradual weakening of *ἵνα* in later Greek see § 44, 8 is no proof of it), yet no one will

deny that expositors have made most immoderate use of this principle and are chargeable with great exaggeration.¹ The alleged use, wholly unknown e.g. to Devar., was denied by Lehmann, Lucian. Tom. I. 71, and afterwards by Fr. Matt. exc. 1, and by Beyer in the n. krit. Journ. IV. 418 ff.; yet cf. also Lücke, Comment. on Jo. II. 371 f.; Mey. on Matt. i. 22. Beyer's view was combated by Steudel in Bengel's n. Archiv IV. 504 f.; and Tittmann, Synon. II. 35 sqq., has also declared himself in favor of *iva* 427 *ἐκβατικόν*.² Others, as Olshausen, bibl. Comment. II. 250 and Bleek, Heb. 7th ed. II. I. 283, are for admitting the ecclastic sense at least in single passages; [Bittm., too, (Gramm. des N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 206) asserts that there are passages of the N. T. where *iva* has more of the ecclastic sense than of the final, and where we shall come nearer the author's thought if we translate it by *so that* (i.e. *ὥστε* with Inf.).] In the first place, most expositors have hitherto overlooked the fact that their judgment of the use of *iva* is often to be shaped in accordance with Hebrew *teleology*, which interchanges historic results with divine designs and decrees, or rather represents every (important, and especially every surprising) event as ordered and designed by God (cf. e.g. Exod. xi. 9; Isa. vi. 10, Knobel in loc.; cf. Rom. xi. 11; see BCrus. bibl. Theol. S. 272; Tholuck, Ausleg. d. Br. a. d. Röm. 3 Aufl. S. 395 ff.),³ and that on this account *iva* may oftentimes be used in the biblical dialect where *we*, agreeably to our 407 conception of the divine government of the world, should have employed 6th ed. *ὥστε*. Other passages have not been examined attentively enough; else it would have become evident that even according to the *ordinary* modes 480 of thought *iva* is employed there correctly. In still other passages it has escaped observation that sometimes the expression *to, in order to*, is employed for rhetorical reasons, by a sort of hyperbole (e.g. so then I must go there in order to get sick! cf. Isa. xxxvi. 12; Ps. li. 6; Liv. 3, 10; Plin. Paneg. 6, 4; I have, then, built a house in order to see it burn down!); or lastly, that *iva* merely expresses (what in the regular course

¹ If indeed with Kühnöl (Hebr. p. 204) we lay it down as a principle that *iva* denotes consilium only *sacrius*, we shall easily make up our minds to take the conjunction *ἐκβατικῶς*.

² He thinks that even in Attic poets he has found instances of the kind. But Aristoph. nub. 58 *δεῖρ' ἔλθ' ἵνα κλέψῃ* is obviously not one; and Aristoph. vesp. 313 receives its explanation in the remark soon to be made above. Likewise in Mr. Anton. 7, 25 *iva* is undoubtedly *τελικόν*. How unceremoniously Tittmann disposes of the N. T. in order to make out his theory is apparent from his treatment (p. 45) of Jno. i. 7, where in fact no unprejudiced expositor will take the second *iva* as *ἐκβατικόν*. Even Kühnöl has not done so.

³ To assert that the Israelites *uniformly* confounded design and result (*Unge der parabol. p. 173*), would be saying too much. This took place only in their religious views of events (in devout speech, BCrus. Jo. I. 198). When these did not influence them the sharp distinction between *in order that* and *so that* must certainly have made itself felt by the Israelites. Their having in their language a special expression for *so that* shows that they had a correct notion of the distinction.

of nature and life is) the *necessary* result, one which is therefore so to speak unconsciously intended by the person that does some given act (cf. Lücke, Jo. I. 603; Fr. Rom. viii. 17), see below on Jno. ix. 2.

Passing over those examples which will be readily understood by the attentive reader (as 1 Pet. i. 7, where Pott from mere habit as it were takes *ἵνα* for *ὥστε*), we select the following, in which *ἵνα* is supposed even by good expositors to be used *de eventu*:

In Luke ix. 45 (the divine) purpose is indicated by *ἵνα* (cf. Matt. xi. 25): that they might not at that time perceive it (otherwise, they would have been perplexed with regard to Jesus). In Luke xiv. 10 *ἵνα* corresponds to *μήποτε* vs. 8, and very clearly expresses *design* (not without reference to the application of the parable): be humble, *in order that* thou mayest be deemed worthy of his heavenly kingdom; the *result* is indicated wholly in *τότε ἔσται* etc. As to Mark iv. 12 (Schott) see Fr. and Olsh. and below, 428 p. 461. Cf. also Luke xi. 50; Matt. xxiii. 34 f. In Jno. iv. 36 the sense ^{7th ed.} is: this is so ordered *in order that* etc. In Jno. vii. 23 (Steudel) the words *ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως* express the design underlying the custom *περιτομὴν λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῳ*. Jno. ix. 2 is to be explained by the Jewish theory of final causes, which in its national exaggeration the disciples shared. Severe, inexplicable, bodily afflictions *must* be divinely ordained penalties for sin: who then by his sin has moved the penal justice of God to cause this man to be born blind? The *necessary* consequence (though undesignedly induced) of *ἁμαρτάνειν* is meant, see Lücke in loc. In Jno. xi. 15 *ἵνα πιστεύσῃτε* is added to *δι' ὑμᾶς* by way of explanation: I rejoice on your account (that I was not there), *to the end that ye may believe*, i.e. now ye cannot but believe. In Jno. xix. 28 *ἵνα* means *in order that*, whether with Luther we join *ἵνα* *τελ. ἡ γραφή* to *πάντα ἤδη τετέλ.* (so Mey.), or with Lücke and de Wette to the following *λέγει*; in the latter case *ἵνα* denotes a purpose attributed by John to Jesus. As to Jno. xvi. 24 see Lücke. In Rom. xi. 31 *ἵνα* does not indicate the design of the *ἀπειθοῦντες*, but God's decree which linked itself to this unbelief cf. vs. 32, to bring them salvation (not as merited, but) out of mercy. In connection with the divine plan, then, unbelief is designed etc., cf. also vs. 11. In the 408 same way is v. 20 f. to be explained, and probably also 2 Cor. i. 9. The ^{8th ed.} same teleological view clearly finds place in Jno. xii. 40 in a quotation from the O. T. Rom. ix. 11 only requires attention to be plain; and it is fairly surprising that Reiche should still take *ἵνα* as ecbatic. The meaning 481 of 2 Cor. v. 4 is obvious; and it passes comprehension how even Schott could render *ἵνα* by *ita ut*. In 1 Cor. v. 5 *εἰς ὅλεθρον τῆς σαρκός* shows how an intention of promoting the good of the *πνεῦμα* is connected with the apostolic *παράδοιναι τῷ Σατανᾷ*; beyond contradiction, therefore, *ἵνα* denotes *in order that*. In 1 Cor. vii. 29 the words *ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες* etc. indicate the (divine) purpose of *ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος* etc. The same applies to Eph. ii. 9. In Eph. iii. 10 *ἵνα γνωρισθῇ* etc. is probably de-

pendent grammatically on τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου in vs. 9, see Mey. In Eph. iv. 14 ἵνα etc. expresses the negative design of what had been stated in vss. 11-13.

As to Gal. v. 17 (Usteri, BCrus.) see Mey. 1 Cor. xiv. 13 ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ προσευχέσθω, ἵνα διερμηνεύῃ means: *let him pray* (not in order to make a display of his χάρισμα τῶν γλωσσῶν, but) with the intention, for the purpose, of interpreting (the prayer). 1 Jno. iii. 1 *behold, how great love the Father has shown us* (with the intention) *that we should be called children of God*; see Lücke; BCrus. is not decided. In Rev. viii. 12 ἵνα expresses the object contemplated in the πλῆττεσθαι of the sun etc.; for πλῆττ. does not denote, as many suppose, the actual darkening of the heavenly bodies, but is the O. T. נָפַח used in reference to the wrath of God, see Ewald in loc. In Rev. ix. 20 the intention of μετανοεῖν is expressed in ἵνα μὴ: they did not amend, *in order* no longer to serve demons etc. The discernment of the fact that the objects of their worship were
429 mere demons and wooden idols, should have led them to μετάνοια, *in order*
1th ed. to emancipate themselves from so degrading a worship. In 1 Thess. v. 4 (Schott, BCrus.) ἵνα denotes design on the part of God, see Lünemann. Under the telic sense comes also John's expression ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα Jno. xii. 23: the hour is (by God's decree) come (consequently is present *in order*) *that I etc.*, cf. xiii. 1; xvi. 2, 32. Inaccurate expositors took ἵνα in these passages as in 1 Cor. iv. 3; vii. 29 for ὅτε or ὅταν. 2 Cor. vii. 9 (Rück., Schott) ye were brought into sorrow, *in order that* (God's purpose) ye might be spared a more severe chastisement. *Ye did not rather mourn, in order that . . . might be expelled?* Here, it is true, ὥστε might also be used if αἰρεσθαι were regarded as the natural result of πενήθειαι. Paul, however, conceives of it as the end: ye should have mourned with this end in view, to expel him. In 2 Cor. xiii. 7 the double ἵνα indicates the aim of Paul's prayer: first negatively, then positively. The correct exposition of Rom. iii. 19 is probably now to be regarded as settled; see also Philippi. Only BCrus. still hesitates. As to Rom. viii. 17 see p. 459. In 2 Cor. i. 17, however, ἵνα preserves its meaning, whether we explain the passage: *what I resolve, do I resolve according to the flesh, that* (with
482 the intent that) *the yea with me may be* (unalterably) *yea, and the nay nay* (i.e. merely to show my own consistency)? or thus: *in order that with me there should be* (found) *yea yea, and nay nay* (that both should be found with me at the same time, that I should afterwards deny what I had
409 affirmed). In 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολή etc. refers to God's purpose in
6th ed. the fact that ἔχομεν τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστράκινοις σκεύεσιν. In Heb. xi. 35 the words ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν indicate the purpose with which those persons refused the ἀπολύτρωσις. On Heb. xii. 27 see Bleek and de Wette. In Rev. xiv. 13 (Schott) probably ἀποθνήσκουσι (from ἀποθνήσκοντες) is to be repeated before ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται. Ewald and de Wette are of a different opinion, cf. above, § 43, 5, p. 317.

That the expression *ἵνα* (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ τὸ ρηθὲν in Matt. or ἡ γραφή, ὁ λόγος in John, which was for some time reduced to a mere *ita ut*, has in the mouth (of Jewish teachers and so) of Jesus and the apostles (when used in reference to an event which has *already occurred*) the more precise sense of *in order that it might be fulfilled*, cannot be doubted; cf. also Olsh. and Mey. on Matt. i. 22. But it certainly was not meant by this that God had caused an event to occur, or *impelled* men *inevitably* to act in a certain manner, for the very purpose of fulfilling the prophecies (Tittm. Synon. II. 44); the expression is very far from implying any sort of fatalism, Lücke Jo. II. 536.¹ With this expression, moreover, is Mark iv. 12 also to be classified: *all things are done to them in parables, in order that they may see and yet not perceive* etc., for: in order that the declaration (in 7th ed. Isa. vi. 10) may be fulfilled: *they will see and yet not* etc. We too are accustomed to interweave such quotations with our discourse, when they may be presumed to be well known. Jesus cannot intend to assert the *general impossibility* of understanding such parables (for then it would have been strange indeed to speak in parables at all); but means that to persons who do not comprehend parables so very plain might be applied the saying of the prophet: *he sees and understands not*; and that there would be such men had been expressly predicted.

In the defective diction of the Apocalypse *ἵνα* is apparently used once, xiii. 13, for *ὥστε* or *ὥς*, after an adjective including the notion of intensity: *magna miracula*, i.e. *tam magna, ut* etc. This would be as admissible at least as *ὅτι* after an intensive, cf. Ducas p. 34, 23, p. 182; Theophan. cont. p. 663; Cedren. II. 47; Canan. p. 465; Theod. H. E. 2, 6, p. 847 ed. Hal., and my Erlang. Pfingstprogr. 1830, p. 11. Yet see p. 338. It is otherwise in 1 Jno. i. 9 (a passage misconstrued even by de Wette and Schott): he is faithful and just, *in order* to forgive us (with a view to 483 forgive, that he may forgive); cf. in German: *er ist scharfsinnig, um einzusehen*. This expressed thus: *er ist scharfsinnig, so dass er einsieht*, conveys in substance the same meaning, yet exhibits the thought under an aspect somewhat different. Here belong also the passages quoted by Tittmann (Synon. II. 39) from Mr. Anton. 11, 3; Justin. M. p. 504. Bengel's remark on Rev. as above: *ἵνα frequens Joanni particula; in omnibus suis libris non nisi semel, cap. 3, 16 ev., ὥστε posuit* etc. is indeed 410 correct, yet is not to be understood as if John used *ἵνα* indiscriminately for *ὥστε*. The reason why *ὥστε* so seldom occurs in John is partly owing to the doctrinal turn of his writings, and partly to the fact that he expresses *result* by other constructions.

¹ Bengel, on Matt. i. 22, says, in the doctrinal phraseology of his time yet in the main correctly, ubicunque haec locutio occurrit, gravitatem evangelistarum tueri debemus et, quamvis hebeti visu nostro, credere ab illis notari eventum non modo talem, qui formulae cuiuspiam veteri respondeat, sed plane talem, qui *propter veritatem divinam non potuerit non subsequi* ineunte N. T.

Some insist that *ἵνα* is used for *ὅτι* in Mark ix. 12 γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενωθῇ. But the words probably mean, *in order that he suffer*; this must be understood as an answer to the question, and ἔρχεται or ἐλεύσεται supplied before it. Nobody will be misled by the passage which Palairot (obs. 127) has quoted from Soph. Aj. 385 οὐχ ὁρᾷς, ἵν' εἴ κακοῦ; where *ἵνα* is an adverb. (Some take ὅπως for *ὅτι*, ὥς in Xen. C. 3, 3, 20; 8, 7, 20, see Poppo in loc.)

Many render also ὅπως *in order that* erroneously by *ita ut* (Kühnöl, Act. 129; Tittm. Synon. II. 55, 58). In Luke ii. 35 (BCrus.?) it is hardly necessary to refer to the Hebrew teleology to discover the meaning of the conjunction. Acts iii. 19 is plain if ὅπως ἀποστείλῃ τὸν Χρ. vs. 20 be understood of the opening of the kingdom of heaven, as vs. 21 requires. What was remarked in reference to *ἵνα* p. 457 sq. elucidates Matt. xxiii. 35. Philem. 6 is connected with vs. 4: *I make mention of thee in my prayers, in order that* etc. Meyer's objections to this reference are groundless. In Heb. ii. 9 (Kühnöl) the clause with ὅπως receives so much light from 431 vs. 10 that scarcely any expositor is now likely to render the ὅπως by *ita ut*. On ὅπως πληρωθῇ see above, p. 461.

Ὡς as a particle of comparison always means in the N. T. *as*, not *so* (for οὕτως), as in 1 Pet. iii. 6 Pott might have learnt even from Bengel. Nowhere also in the N. T. is there a reason for writing it ὡς—a form, moreover, very rare (Heind. and Stallb. Plat. Protag. c. 15) in prose writers (with the exception of the Ionic). In Heb. iii. 11; iv. 3 (Sept.) ὡς may be rendered by *that, so that*; in which sense it is sometimes used with the Indicative even in good Greek authors (Her. 1, 163; 2, 185). On Mark xiii. 34 and similar passages, see Fr.; to assume there with Mey. an anacoluthon is quite unnecessary.

1. Adverbs are so indispensable in defining closely relations of quality, that we can easily understand how it is that the N. T. writers, though inferior to the Greek prose authors as respects the use of conjunctions, have yet mastered pretty well the resources of the Greek tongue in adverbs, considered *extensively*; it is only when it is viewed *intensively*, i.e. as respects the finer shades of thought conveyed by several of the simple adverbs (e.g. *ἀν*) and by adverbial compounds, that their usage betrays them to be foreigners who did not feel the need of such refinements.

Derivative (adjectival) adverbs are the more numerous in the N. T., because the later Greek had derived from many adjectives 411 adverbial forms previously unknown, and had adopted into ordinary prose other words of the class which had hitherto been used

only in poetry. Cf. *ἀκαίρως* (Sir. xxxii. 4), *ἀναξίως* (2 Macc. xiv. 42), *ἀνόμως* (2 Macc. viii. 17), *ἀποτόμως* (since Polyb.), *ἐκτενῶς* (likewise; Lob. Phryn. 311), *ἀπερισπᾶστος* (likewise; Lob. 415), *ἐτοίμως* (for which the Attic language at least used *ἐξ ἐτοίμου*), *εὐθύμως* (since Polyb.), *ἐσχάτως* (cf. Lob. 389), *εὐ-ἀρέστως* (Arrian. Epict. 1, 12, 21), *κενῶς* (Arrian. Epict. 2, 17, 6 (*εἰς κενόν*)), *προσφαίτως*, *τελείως*, *πολυτρόπως* and *πολυμερῶς*, *ῥητῶς*, *ἐθνικῶς* in the biblical sense.

Among the remaining adverbs also some belong to later prose, and give offence to the grammarians; e.g. *ὑπερέκεινα* see Thom. M. 336, *οὐρανόθεν*, *παιδιόθεν*, *μακρόθεν* Lob. 93 sq.

The use of the adjective (or partic.) Neut.¹ for the corresponding adverb, which became more and more common in later Greek, does not exceed in the N. T. the limits observed in the earlier 432 prose: cf. *πρῶτον*, *ὑστερον*, *πρότερον* and *τὸ πρότερον*, *πλησιον*, 7th ed. *τυχόν*, *ἐλαττον*, *πολύ*, *τὸ νῦν ἔχον* Acts xxiv. 25 *for the present* (Vig. p. 9, cf. Hm. p. 888), *τοῖναντίον*, *λοιπόν* and *τὸ λοιπόν* (Hm. Vig. 706), *ταχύ*, *πυκνά*, *ἴσα*, *μακρά*, *πολλά* (*often*, *σφόδρα*) and *τὰ πολλά* (*for the most part*), for most of which no adverbial forms existed.

In general, there is nothing peculiar in the N. T. diction in regard to the use of adjectives, with or without prepositions (elliptically or not), for adverbs: cf. e.g. *τοῦ λοιποῦ* (Hm. as above; 485 van Marle, florileg. p. 232 sq.), *πεζῇ*, *πάντῃ*, *καταμόνας*, *κατ' ἰδίαν*, *ιδία*, *καθόλου*, *εἰς κενόν*, and the Lexicons under the words. Instead of *κατὰ ἐκούσιον* Philem. 14 (Num. xv. 3) *ἐκουσίως*, *ἐκουσία* or *ἐξ ἐκουσίας* is more common in Greek. It is not necessary to speak of genuine Greek compounds, such as *παραχρήμα*; on the other hand, in conformity with the genius of the Hebrew-Aramaic tongue, abstract substantives with prepositions, instead of adverbial forms actually existing, are more frequent than in Greek authors: e.g. *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* Matt. xxii. 16, *ἐπ' ἀληθείας* Luke xxii. 59 (for *ἀληθῶς*), *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* Acts xvii. 31 for *δικαίως*, see above, § 51. In 2 Cor. iv. 16 *ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ*, as a circumlocution for the adverb *daily* (*καθ' ἡμέραν* or *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*, common in the N. T.), would be without example in the N. T. cf. *כִּי כִּי*, see Vorst, Hebr. 307 sq.; Ewald, kr. Gr. 638.² Probably, however, Paul designedly used the expression *day by day*, to indicate the progress of *ἀνακαινοῦσθαι*; whereas *καθ' (ἐκάστην) ἡμέραν ἀνακαινοῦνται* might be taken also in another sense. Further, we find an analogous con-

¹ However, what Hm. Eurip. Hel. p. 30 sq. says in elucidation of this use of neuters, deserves consideration.

² Cf. *ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* Georg. Phrantz. 4, 4, p. 356.

struction (though only in a local sense) in Mark vi. 39 ἐπέταξεν ἀνακλίνει πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια *catervatim*, cf. Exod. viii. 14, vs. 40 ἀνέπεσον πρασιαὶ πρασιαί *areolatim*, see § 37, 3. These words are strictly in apposition, cf. Luke ix. 14. What Georgi in his *Vindic.* p. 340 has collected is of another sort.

- 412 When a simple accusative of a noun (substantive) is used adverbially, ^{6th ed.} this use arises strictly from an abbreviated construction (Hm. Vig. 883).

Besides the well-known χάριν, under this head come

a. τὴν ἀρχὴν *throughout, altogether* (Vig. 723), which is probably so to be taken also in Jno. viii. 25 (see Lücke's careful examination of the passage): *altogether what I also say unto you* (I am entirely what in my discourses I profess to be). The context furnishes no ground whatever for preferring the interrogative to the categoric interpretation; Meyer's exposition is complicated, and appears to me least satisfactory of all.

b. ἀκμήν used in later Greek for ἐτι, as in Matt. xv. 16; see Lob. Phryn. 123 sq.

Adverbs may be joined not only to verbs, but also to nouns, as in 1 Cor.

- 433 xii. 31 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι, see no. 2, and 1 Cor. vii. 35 πρὸς τῇ αὐτῇ τὸ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως.

2. The adverbial notion is sometimes expressed concretely as adjectival, and subjoined to the substantive (Mtth. 1001; Kühner 486 II. 382). This takes place not only when it is to the substantive (not to the verb) that a predicate (logically) belongs (though in German an adverb is used),¹ but also where such reference to the substantive appears to be more favorable to perspicuity:² Acts xiv. 10 ἀνάστηθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου ὀρθός, Mark iv. 28 αὐτομάτῃ ἢ γῇ καρποφορεῖ, Acts xii. 10 (Iliad. 5, 749), Rom. x. 19 πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει (*as the first*), 1 Tim. ii. 13; Jno. xx. 4 etc.;³ Luke

¹ So Jno. iv. 18 τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἶρηκας *this hast thou spoken as (something) true*, hoc verum dixisti. On the other hand, τ. ἀληθὲς εἶρ. (which Kühnol demands) would be ambiguous. Cf. Xen. vectig. 1, 2 ὅπως δὲ γνωσθῇ, ὅτι ἀληθὲς τοῦτο λέγω, Demosth. Halon. 34 b. τοῦτό γε ἀληθὲς λέγουσιν.

² Cf. especially Bremi, Exc. 2, ad Lys. 449 sq., Mehlhorn, de adjectivorum pro adverbio positore. ratione et usu. Glogav. 1828. See also Vechner, Hellenol. 215 sqq.; Zumpt, lat. Gramm. §§ 682, 686; Krütz, Sall. I. 125; II. 131, 216. In Latin this form of expression is in general still more prevalent. Eichhorn (Einleit. ins N. T. II. 261) makes an erroneous application of the rule in supposing that Jno. xiii. 34 ἐντολὴν καὶνὴν δίδωμι can signify, *anew (καὶνῶς) will I give you the commandment*. But in that case John must at least have written (ταῦτην) τὴν ἐντολὴν καὶνὴν δίδωμι. Even the position of the words precludes taking μόνον adverbially in Jno. v. 44; see Lücke.

³ Ordinal adjectives are used for adverbs only when *first, second*, etc. refer to the person; that is, when something is expressed which the person did *before* all other persons (was the first to do); but when the person is represented as doing a *first act*, in distinction from other subsequent acts of the same person, the adverb must be used. Cf. also Krütz, Sallust. II. 174.

xxi. 34 μήποτε ἐπιστῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη (var. αἰφνιδίως), Acts xxviii. 13 δευτεραῖοι ἤλθομεν εἰς Ποσιόλους, 1 Cor. ix. 17 εἰ γὰρ ἐκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω ... εἰ δὲ ἄκων etc. Cf. also Luke v. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 6, etc. With *these* adjectives the construction described is frequent, not to say predominant, in Greek authors (cf. in regard to αὐτόματος Her. 2, 66; Lucian. necyom. 1; Xen. An. 5, 7, 3; 4, 3, 8; Cyr. 1, 4, 13; Hell. 5, 1, 14; Dion. H. 1, 139; Wetst. I. 569, in regard to πρῶτος Xen. An. 2, 3, 19; Cyr. 1, 4, 2; Paus. 6, 4, 2; Charit. 2, 2, as to δευτερ. Her. 6, 106; Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 2; Arrian. Al. 5, 22, 4; Wetst. II. 654, as to αἰφνίδιος Thuc. 6, 49; 8, 28, *suditus* irrupit Tac. hist. 3, 47); yet with other ⁴¹⁸ adjectives not uncommon: Xen. Cyr. 5, 3, 55 αὐτὸς παρελαύνων ^{6th ed.} τὸν ἵππον ... ἡσυχος κατεθεᾶτο etc. 6, 1, 45 εὖ οἶδ', ὅτι ἄσμενος ἂν πρὸς ἄνδρα ... ἀπαλλαγῇσεται (Demosth. Zenoth. 576 b.; 2 Macc. x. 33; Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 48; see, on the other hand, Acts xxi. 17), 7, 5, 49 εἰ ταῦτα πρόθυμός σοι συλλάβοιμι (var.), 4, 2, 11 ἐθελούσιοι ἐξίοντες, Dio Chr. 40, 495¹ πυκνοὶ βαδίζοντες, Isocr. ep. 8 τελευτῶν (*at last, finally*) ὑπεσχόμην, cf. Palair. 214; Valcken. Her. 8, 130; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 156; Krü. 210 f.

How far it is correct to say that adjectives are used instead of adverbs ⁴³⁴ is obvious from the preceding observations. To suppose, also, that adverbs ^{7th ed.} are used instead of adjectives is a mistake (Ast,¹ Plat. polit. p. 271), as ⁴⁸⁷ in Matt. i. 18 ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν, xix. 10 εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (LXX. Rom. iv. 18) 1 Pet. ii. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 10 ὡς ὁσίως κ. δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν ἐγενήθημεν, vs. 13; Rom. ix. 20 τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως; In the first of these passages εἶναι is not the simple copula (as in αὕτη or τοιοῦτό ἐστι), but denotes *to be of a certain condition or character, stand, comparatum esse*.² In Rom. ix. 20 οὕτως denotes the manner of ποιεῖν, the consequence of which is his being now the person that he is. Cf. Bremi, Aesch. Ctesiph. p. 278; Bhdy. S. 337 f.; Hm. Soph. Antig. 633; Wex, Antig. I. 206; Mehlhorn in the allg. Lit.-Zeit. 1833. Ergzbl. no. 108; Lob. Paralip. p. 151; as to Lat. Kritiz, Sallust. Cat. p. 306 sq. Likewise in 1 Cor. vii. 7 ἕκαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα, ὃς μὲν οὕτως, ὃς δὲ οὕτως the adverbs are in place: *each has his own (peculiar) gift, one after this manner, another after that.*

A closer approximation to adjectives is found

a. In certain local adverbs, such as ἐγγὺς εἶναι, χωρὶς τινος εἶναι Eph. ii. 12, πόρρω εἶναι Luke xiv. 32 (Krü. 244).

¹ His article in the Landshuter Zeitschr. f. Wissensch. und Kunst III. II. 133 ff. I have not had an opportunity of comparing.

² In Jno. vi. 55 there is a variant. Recent editors have preferred ἀληθής, see *Lücke*; who, however, ably combats at the same time the opinion that ἀληθῶς and ἀληθής are synonymous.

b. In adverbs of degree annexed to substantives (ὧν being understood); as, *μίλα στρατηγός* Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 39, see Bhdy. 338. Usually they are placed before the noun, but sometimes after it. Even ancient expositors thus understood 1 Cor. xii. 31 καὶ ἐτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δέκνυμι: *a super-eminent (more excellent) way*. Such an adverbial adjunct is placed after the noun in 1 Cor. viii. 7 τῇ συνειδήσει ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδῶλου, Phil. i. 26; 2 Pet. ii. 3, probably also in 2 Cor. xi. 23; see Mey.

3. The adverbial notion of *intensity* is not unfrequently expressed by joining to a verb a participle of the same verb (see § 45, 8), or a cognate noun in the Dative (Ablative): Luke xxii. 15 ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα *I have earnestly desired*, Jno. iii. 29 χαρὰ χαίρει *impreise laetatur*, Acts iv. 17 ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλησώμεθα *let us straitly threaten*, v. 28 παρωγγελία παρηγγειλαμεν ὑμῖν, xxiii. 14 ἀναθέματι 414 ἀνεθεματίσαμεν *we have bound ourselves under a great curse*, Jas. 414 ed. v. 17, from Sept. Matt. xiii. 14 (Isa. vi. 9); Matt. xv. 4 θανάτῳ 488 τελευτάτῳ (Exod. xxi. 15). This form of expression is of frequent occurrence in the Sept. and the Apocr., and is there an imitation of the Hebrew Infinitive absolute, cf. Isa. xxx. 19; lxvi. 10; Deut. 435 vii. 26; Exod. xxi. 20; Josh. xxiv. 10; 1 Sam. xii. 25; xiv. 39; Sir. xlviii. 11; Judith vi. 4 (Vorst, Hebr. p. 624 sq.); yet it is sometimes found in Greek authors also (Schaefer. Soph. II. 313; 435 Ast, Plat. Epin. 586; Lob. Paralip. 524) e.g. Plat. symp. 195 b. 714 ed. φεύγων φυγῇ τὸ γῆρας,¹ Phaedr. 265 d. ἐμοὶ φαίνεται τὰ μὲν ἄλλα παιδιᾷ πεπαισθαι, Phot. cod. 80, 113 σπουδῇ σπουδάζειν, Soph. Oed. R. 65 ὕπνῳ εὐδοντα, Ael. 8, 15 νίκῃ ἐνίκησε.

Of a different nature are those passages in which the Dative of the noun is accompanied by an adjective (or any other adjunct); as, ταῖς μεγίσταις τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν, ζημιούτω τῇ νομιζομένῃ ζημίᾳ (Schwarz as above). These coincide with the mode of expression explained in § 32, 2; cf. Xen. A. 4, 5, 33; Plut. Coriol. 3; Aristoph. Plut. 592; Aeschyl. Prom. 392; Hom. hymn. in Merc. 572. From the N. T. see 1 Pet. i. 8 ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρῇ ἀνεκκλαλήτῳ etc. Even the expression γάμῳ γεγαμηκώς in Demosth. Boeot. 639 a, has no connection with the construction in question; it means, as it were, *having espoused by marriage* i.e. living in lawful wedlock, as γαμῆσθαι alone is applied also to concubinage. Even Xen. An. 4, 6, 25 οἱ πελτασταὶ δρόμῳ ἔθεον *I would except, as δρόμος denotes a particular sort of rapid advance: at a run, on the trot*. As to Soph. Oed. C. 1625 (1621), see Hm. in loc.

¹ Lob., as above, shows that in Greek authors this form of expression is used only in a figurative sense, not in a physical, as in Jer. (xxvi.) xlv. 5. Moreover, in Latin the well-known occidione occidere is analogous to this construction.

4. Certain adverbial notions the Greeks were accustomed to regard as *verbal*; accordingly, the verb which was to have been qualified by one of these notions, they made, in the form of an Infinitive or Participle, to depend on it as principal verb (Mtth. 1279 ff.; cf. Kritz, Sallust. 1, 89): Heb. xiii. 2 ἐλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες they (escaped — their own — notice as entertaining) entertained *unconsciously, unawares* (Wetst. in loc.; cf. also Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 7, 3; Tob. xii. 13),¹ Acts xii. 16 ἐπέμενε κρούων he knocked *persistently* (Jno. viii. 7) cf. Lösner, obs. 203; Mark xiv. 8 προέλαβε μυρίσαι *antevertit ungere*, she anointed *beforehand* (Kypke in loc.; φθάνω also is sometimes used with the Inf. see Wyttenbach, Juliani orat. p. 181; cf. *rapere occurat* Horat. Od. 2, 12, 28), Matt. vi. 5 φιλοῦσι προσεύχεσθαι they love to pray (cf. Ael. 14, 37 φιλῶ τὰ ἀγάλματα . . . ὀρᾶν) Wetst. and Fr. in loc., Luke xxiii. 12, see Bornem. Whether θέλω also (ἐθέλω? Hm. 489 Soph. Philoct. p. 238) is used as a finite verb to denote the adverbial notion *gladly, with pleasure, cheerfully* (sponte), has lately been questioned, (that the Partic. of θέλω is so used is well known, cf. Mey. on Col. ii. 18).² And in fact Jno. viii. 44 τὰς ἐπιθυμίας 415 τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν must be rendered: *the lusts of 6th ed. your father ye will (are resolved and inclined to) do* (carry into 436 effect), either in general (your hearts impel you to follow the will of Satan) or because ye go about to kill me (vs. 40). The Plural here, which troubles de Wette, has already been explained by Lücke. In Jno. vi. 21, also, the interpretation given by Kühnöl and others is necessary only in case an attempt (for which there is no authority) is made to harmonize the narrative of this evangelist with that of Matt. and Mark. At the same time this must be admitted, that ἠθελον ποιῆσαι they *purposed, were inclined, to do* (Arist. polit. 6, 8) when from the context it is obvious that the sense is not confined to the mere act of will,³ may signify *they did it designedly, spontaneously, gladly*, e.g. Isocr. Callim. 914 οἱ δυστυχισάσης τῆς πόλεως προκινδυνεύειν ὑμῶν ἠθέλησαν who were willing to expose

¹ Yet in Ael. 1, 7 οἱτοί, ὅταν αὐτοὺς λαθόντες δοκνύμου φάγωσι, we find the construction which corresponds to German usage. The Inf. instead of the Part. after λαθάνειν occurs in Leo, Chronogr. p. 19.

² In 2 Pet. iii. 5 λαθόντα τοῦτο θέλοντας I prefer the rendering *latet eos hoc* (what follows) *volentes*, i.e. *volentes ignorant*, to the other: *latet eos* (what follows), *hoc* (what precedes) *volentes*, i.e. *contententes*; since the former brings out more clearly the guilt of the mockers. In Col. ii. 18 also θέλων is not to be taken as an adverb.

³ In Jno. vi. 21 the matter appears according to John's account not to have gone beyond a mere act of the will.

themselves to danger for you (and have proved their willingness by their deeds), who cheerfully encountered dangers in your cause (Xen. Cyr. 1, 1, 3). The phrase *ἐθέλουσι ποιεῖν*, however, when it does not indicate a mere act of the will, signifies according to the nature of the case: *they do willingly, cheerfully* (Demosth. Ol. 2 p. 6 a. *ὅταν μὲν ὑπ' εὐνοίας τὰ πράγματα συστήῃ καὶ πᾶσι ταῦτὰ συμφέρεῖ ... καὶ συμπονεῖν καὶ φέρειν τὰς συμφορὰς καὶ μένειν ἐθέλουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι*), or *they do it of their own accord, spontaneously* (Xen. Hier. 7, 9 *ὅταν ἄνθρωποι ἄνδρα ἡγησάμενοι ... ἱκανὸν ... στεφανώσι ... καὶ δωρεῖσθαι ἐθέλωσι*).¹ Cf. besides Stallb. Plat. symp. p. 56, and Gorg. p. 36; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 28. According to this, Mark xii. 38; Luke xx. 46 *τῶν θελούντων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς* *who wish to go about* i.e. who love to go about, would not be bad Greek (though *τῶν φιλούντων περ.* would be preferable); yet this expression is perhaps to be referred primarily to the Hebraistic *θέλειν τι delectari re*, as in Mark *θέλειν* is immediately followed by the Accusative *ἀσπασμούς* as its object.

5. In Hebrew, adverbial notions are to a still greater extent regarded as verbal; since in that language they not only are grammatically construed with the verb (which shows that the two are essentially connected), as in *חָשַׁבְתִּי שָׁנָה* i.e. *he sent again*, which is imitated in Luke xx. 11 f. *προσέθετο πέμψαι* (but in Mark xii. 4 we find *καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν*), Acts xii. 3 *προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον* *besides he apprehended Peter also*, Mark xiv. 25 var. (thus frequently in Sept. *προστιθέναι* and Mid. *προστίθεσθαι* 437 Gen. iv. 2; xi. 6; Exod. x. 28; xiv. 13; Deut. iii. 26; xviii. 16; 7th ed. Josh. vii. 12, etc., likewise with Inf. Pass. Judges xiii. 21), but also both are used as finite verbs and joined together by *and*: *he does much and weeps* (Ewald 631).² This last construction has been retained in particular phrases through all periods of the language; whereas in other cases this mode of expression (as it were a *ἐν διὰ δυοῖν* with verbs) passes over perceptibly into the other, which becomes predominant. In the N. T. also it was thought that instances of that former and more simple construction were to be

¹ Cf. also Orig. c. Marcion. p. 35 *Ὡς τὰ δίκαια ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἰρημένα βόλαι ἀδίκως νοεῖν thou art inclined to understand*, understood designally.

² The Sept. reproduce verbatim only a few of these Hebrew constructions, e.g. Judg. xiii. 10 *ἐτάχυνεν ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἔδραμε*, 1 Sam. xxv. 42; Ps. cv. 13; Dan. x. 18; Hos. i. 6. Cf. on the other hand, Gen. xxvi. 18; xxx. 31; Job xix. 3; Ps. xxxii. 3. The phrase *חָשַׁבְתִּי שָׁנָה* is also rendered in the Sept. by the Part.: Gen. xxxviii. 5 *προσθεῖσα ἔτι ἔτεκε υἱόν* etc., xxv. 1 *προσθέμενος Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβε γυναῖκα*, Job xxix. 1; xxxvi. 1. It occurs once also in Luke xix. 11. Besides, cf. Thiersch de Pentat. alex. p. 177.

found,¹ as Rom. x. 20 ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει *speaks out boldly*, Luke vi. 48 ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε *he dug deep* (Schott), Col. ii. 5 χαίρων καὶ βλέπων *seeing with joy* (Beng. and Schott) etc. But in many passages referred to this head this explanation is quite inadmissible, — as in 2 Cor. ix. 9 ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκε τοῖς πένησιν which must be rendered: *he dispersed abroad, he gave to the poor* (Ps. cxii. 9), — in others it is unnecessary, as in Luke vi. 48 *he dug and deepened* (crescit oratio, Beza); Jno. viii. 59 ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (BCrus.) means: *he hid himself and went forth* i.e. either withdrew from their sight, rendered himself invisible (according to which a miraculous ἀφανισμός of Christ is narrated), or he concealed himself and went (soon after) away (Lücke, Mey.). The narrator might easily from his point of view combine thus, and connect by καί, two events not precisely simultaneous, yet following one another in rapid succession. Perhaps we should prefer, with Bengel, the first of the two explanations given, as 491 the one more in accordance with the character of *this* evangelist, and in fact established if the words διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν are genuine. In Acts xv. 16 the word ἀναστρέψω has nothing corresponding to it either in the Sept. or in the Hebrew (Amos ix. 11); probably to the apostle as he makes the quotation it means, (to him) *I will turn (myself) again* (as also יָשׁוּב in many passages of the O. T. must by itself be rendered, e.g. Jer. xii. 15 יָשׁוּבָהּ יְהוָה I will return — to them, antithetic to Jehovah's turning away from them — *and have mercy on them*; Sept. ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἐλεήσω αὐτούς), as iterum is already contained in the compounds ἀνοικοδομήσω, ἀνορθώσω. Likewise in Matt. xviii. 3 ἐὰν μὴ στραφῇτε καὶ γένησθε etc. and Acts vii. 42 ἔστρεψεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ παρέδωκε this verb appears independently: *to turn* i.e. according to the connection, respectively *turn about, repent, and turn away*. In Luke i. 68 the absolute construction of ἐπεσκέψατο (ἔβη) 438 is obvious. The above passage from Rom. is more like the Latin 7th ed. *audet dicere*; in which construction the idea of the first verb is not conceived of as subordinate. Render: *he makes bold and* 417 6th ed. *says*; ἀποτολ. indicates the frame of mind, λέγειν its result, the utterance of the mental state in the bold saying. In Col. as above Paul probably means to say two things:² in spirit I am present

¹ Every discriminating reader will perceive that the constructions from Xen., Plaut., and Persius, which Kühnöl on Luke vi. 48 has adduced as analogous, are of a different nature.

² In the quotation by Weist. from Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 10, 2 the Codd. read χαίρων καὶ βλέπων or simply βλέπων.

with you, *rejoicing* (over you, *σὺν ὑμῖν*) and *beholding your order* etc. To the general statement is annexed one that is special. It is also possible that in *βλέπων* etc. the ground of the joy is subjoined, and *καὶ* is to be rendered *namely, that is*. As, however, the *rejoicing* is something caused by *βλέπειν*, the adverbial notion expressed independently by a finite verb could in no event *precede* the principal notion;¹ nor could such a form of expression be supported, on careful consideration, by Hebrew analogy.² Jas. iv. 2 *φονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε* does not mean: *ye envy even to the death* (Schott), *mortally*,³ but as Stolz renders it, *ye kill and envy*; see Kern in loc. In Rev. iii. 19 the two verbal notions can easily be taken each by itself. Others, even Züllig, find here a *hysteron-proteron*; Hengstenberg on the passage is right.

Against the rendering of Mark x. 21 *ἡγάπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ blande eum compellavit* (also Schott), see Mey. in loc.

439 6. As prepositions without a case are sometimes used as adverbs
7th ed. (see § 50, note 2, p. 423), so on the other hand, and still more
418 frequently, adverbs (especially of place and time) are connected
6th ed. with cases: as *ἄμα* (even in Her. 6, 118 *ἄμα τῷ στρατῷ*) which in later Greek became almost a preposition (*ἄμα αὐτοῖς* Matt. xiii. 29 equivalent to *σὺν αὐτοῖς*, cf. Lucian. Asin. 41, 45; Polyb. 4, 48, 6 etc. see Klotz, Devar. II. 97 sq.), *ἕως* of time and space (Klotz II. 564, cf. *ἕως τούτου* — for which the Greeks use *ἄχρι, μέχρι*, or in a

¹ Where the adverbial idea is promoted grammatically to an independence which does not logically belong to it, it can maintain such independence only by following the principal verb; cf. Plut. Cleom. 18 *εἰσελθὼν καὶ βιασάμενος* equivalent to *βίη εἰσελθόν*.

² The Hebrew verbs which when placed before other finite verbs are taken adverbially, express either an idea considered independently, as Job xix. 3 *ye are not ashamed and ye defend me*, or a general idea which is more precisely defined by one more special, as: *he made haste and ran to meet the Philistines*; *he turned back and dug* etc. In like manner 1 Sam. ii. 3; which poetic passage, however, cannot be used in explaining the prose of the N. T.

³ *Gebser* gains nothing by appealing to Jas. i. 11 and iii. 14 in support of this interpretation. In i. 11 *ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος . . . καὶ ἐξήρανε* expresses the rapid scorching of the herbage more aptly than *ἀνατείλας ἐξήρανε*, cf. *veni vidi vici*, not *veniens vidi*, or *veni vidensque vici*. To rise and to scorch is one act; not, 'after he is risen, he sets about scorching.' It is precisely by expressing each of the moments by a finite verb that their rapid succession is more graphically represented. The second passage, iii. 14 *μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας*, I render (and *Wiesinger* concurs with me) *do not glory and lie against the truth*; *κατὰ τῆς ἀλ.* belongs properly to *κατακαυχᾶσθαι* (Rom. xi. 18). But the apostle to explain *κατακ.* thrusts in forthwith a stronger expression. By resolving it into *μὴ κατακαυχώμενοι ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀλθ.* we gain only the tautology *κατὰ τ. ἀλ. ψεύδεσθαι*, while the *κατὰ* in *κατακαυχ.* is wholly neglected.

local sense *ἕως εἰς*, *ἕως ἐπὶ*; yet cf. Diod. S. 1, 27 *ἕως ὠκεανοῦ*), also with names of persons (*even unto*, to Luke iv. 42; Acts ix. 38; cf. Lament. iii. 39), *χωρίς* (Jno. xv. 5 *separated from*, *μὴ μένοντες ἐν ἑμοί* vs. 4, cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 7; Polyb. 3, 103, 8, then very frequently *without* and *besides*), *πλησίον* Jno. iv. 5 with Gen., as in Sept. cf. Xen. Mem. 1, 4, 6; Aeschin. dial. 3, 3 (in Greek authors also with Dat.), but *παρὰπλησίον* Phil. ii. 27 with Dat. (with very slight variation of Codd.), *ἐγγύς* with Gen. Jno. iii. 23; vi. 19; xi. 18 etc. and with Dat. Acts ix. 38; xxvii. 8, *ὁφεί* with Gen. Matt. xxviii. 1, *ἔμπροσθεν* with Gen., *ὀπίσω* (exclusively Hellenistic), *ὀπίσθεν* with Gen., *ὑπερέκεινα* and *ἐλαττον* ditto, and also *ἔσω* and *ἔξω* with Gen. Several of these are so frequently construed with a case, that they may be taken directly as prepositions; just as in *ἕως*, *χωρίς*, *ἄχρι*, *μέχρι*, the adverbial meaning is already perceptibly receding, and in *ἄνευ* (in the N. T.) has entirely disappeared.

Under this head comes also Phil. ii. 15 *μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς* (cf. Theophan. p. 530), which Lchm. and Tdf. have properly admitted into the text. But in Matt. xiv. 24 *τὸ πλοῖον ἤδη μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν* the word *μέσον* is an adjective: *navis jam media maris erat*, see Krebs in loc. In general, the use of adverbs with the Gen. in the N. T. diction appears very simple if we compare with it the far bolder constructions employed in the Greek of all periods, see Bhdy. 157 f.

Combinations such as *ἕως ἄρτι*, *ἕως τότε*, *ἕως ὅτου*, *ἕως πρῶτῃ*, *ἕως ἔξω*, *ἕως κάτω* and the like, are, indeed, especially common in later prose authors (in Sept. cf. *ἕως τότε* Neh. ii. 16, *ἕως τίνος*, *ἕως οὗ* Gen. xxvi. 13), but some such had already been sanctioned by earlier writers, Bhdy. 196; Krü. 266 f. As to adverbs with the article instead of nouns, see § 18, 3 p. 109.

7. Adverbs of place, even when not in relative clauses (§ 23, 2), are (originally by force of an attraction, Hm. Vig. 790, ad Soph. Antig. 517; Wex, Antig. I. 107; Weber, Demosth. p. 446; Krüger, grammat. Untersuchungen III. 306 ff.) interchanged by good prose writers; particularly adverbs of rest are joined to verbs of motion when at the same time continuance in a place is to be expressed, Hm. as above, Bhdy. 350 (see above, on *ἐν*, § 50, 4) cf. Matt. ii. 22 *ἐφοβήθη ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν*, xvii. 20; xxviii. 16. So in the later writers *ἐκεῖ* came to be used, freely for *ἐκεῖσε*, *ποῦ* and *ὅπου* for *ποῖ* and *ὅποι*, *οὗ* for *whither*. They are thus used in the Sept. and even in the N. T. (where e.g. *ὅποι* never occurs); as, Jno. xviii. 3 *ὁ Ἰούδας . . . ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων* ^{7th ed.}

419 (Arrian. Epict. 24, 113),¹ Rom. xv. 24 ἰφ' ἑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι
 6th ed. ἐκεῖ (to Spain), Jno. vii. 35; iii. 8 (πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ἰπάγει),
 viii. 14; xi. 8; Luke xxiv. 28; Jas. iii. 4; Rev. xiv. 4, etc. This
 is an abuse easily to be explained in the language of conversation
 (in ὧδε and ἐνθάδε, ἐνταυθοῖ, the meanings *hic* and *huc* coalesced
 still earlier, Krü. 268), and which ought not to be denied in the
 written language of the N. T.²

With respect to other adverbs of place, not only does ἔσω stand
 494 for *within* (ἐνδον does not occur in the N. T.) Jno. xx. 26; Acts
 v. 23 (Ezek. ix. 6; Lev. x. 18), but also ἐκεῖσε for ἐκεῖ Acts xxii. 5
 ἄξων καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας (see Wetst. in loc., cf. especially οἱ
 ἐκεῖσε οἰκούντες Hippocr. vict. san. 2, 2 p. 35, and the Index to
 Agathias, to Menander, and to Malal. ed. Bonn.). On the other
 hand, Acts xiv. 26. ὅθεν ἦσαν παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάριτι, as even
 Luther saw, is quite regular, cf. Mey. (and the emendation by
 Hemsterhuis, ἦσαν, inadmissible in any case); and in Acts xxi. 3
 ἐκεῖσε retains its meaning, as does ὅπου in Luke xii. 17. The
 adverbs ἔξωθεν, ἔσωθεν, κάτω, in prose usage, as is well known,
 represent both relations, *from without* and *without, downwards*
 and *beneath*, etc.

Further, how the usage of the later prose writers keeps pace with
 that of the N. T. may be seen from the collections of Lob. Phryn.
 p. 43 sq. 128; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 9. Cf. besides, Buttm. Philoct.
 p. 107; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 95 sqq.;³ Schoem. Plutarch.
 Cleom. p. 186; Hartung, Casus S. 85 ff., also Kypke and Elsner
 ou Matt. ii. 22.

That adverbs of place (relat.) are also used with reference to
persons is well known, cf. Rev. ii. 13 παρ' ἑμῶν, ὅπου ὁ σταυρ.

¹ Her. 1, 121 ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖ plainly signifies: *having arrived there* (cf. the preceding 10: χαίρων ἐς Πέρσας), and so might ἔρχεσθαι in Jno. xviii. 3 perhaps be rendered. Heb. vi. 20 ὅπου πρόδρομος εἰσῆλθε may mean, *where* entered; see Böhme, whom Bleek has not understood.

² Many passages, to be sure, have been referred to this head which are of another sort, e.g. Matt. xxvi. 36; Luke xii. 17, 18. Here ἐκεῖ and οἱ certainly mean: *there, where*. Not so Luke x. 1, where Hölemann's translation *ubi iter facere in animo erat* is false because ἔρχεσθαι does not mean *iter facere*. Cf. Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 106.

³ It is, indeed, not to be overlooked that forms such as τοῦ, τοῖ, also ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖσε, might be easily exchanged by transcribers, as actually happens often in MSS. of Greek authors (Schaeff. Eurip. Hec. 1062). Nevertheless, in the case of the N. T. the number of such variations noted is extremely small. Also corrections, as Acts xxii. 5 ἐκεῖ, very rarely occur, since the readers were too much accustomed to such use of these adverbs to take offence at it. Besides, the old (Homeric) language coincides with the later prose in the interchange of local adverbs, while Attic prose keeps the forms more distinct.

κατοικεῖ Vechner, hellenol. p. 234. Besides, we find them used occasionally with a loose reference, Jno. xx. 19 τ. θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων οὐ πού ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταί there (of the chamber) where, Mark ii. 4; cf. Matt. ii. 9 (Krü. 268).

§ 55. NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

441

7th ed.

1. The Greek language has, as is well known, two orders of negatives, οὐ, οὔτε, οὐκέτι (οὐδεῖς) etc., and μή, μήτε, μηκέτι (μηδεῖς) etc. The distinction between the two has been most fully unfolded by Hermann (ad Vig. p. 804 ff.; cf. Mtth. II. 1437 ff; Mdv. 235 ff.). Οὐ, for instance, is used when something is denied in plain terms and directly (as a matter of fact); μή, where something is denied as mere matter of thought (according to supposition, and under conditions): the former is the *objective*, the latter the *subjective* negation.¹ And this distinction is in substance observed also in the N. T.;² as will be clear first of all,

¹ Cf. besides, *L. Richter*, de usu et discrim. particul. οὐ et μή. Crossen, 1831-1834, 3 Commentatt. 4to.; *F. Franke*, de particulis negantib. linguae gr. Rintel. 1832-1833, 2 Comment. 4to. (reviewed by *Benfey*, in n. Jahrb. f. Philol. XII. 147 ff.); *Baumlein*, in d. Zeitschr. f. Alterthumswiss. 1847. nr. 97-99, and remarks, highly instructive on the general subject also, concerning particular uses of both forms of negation in *Hm. Soph.* Oed. R. 568; Ajac. 76; Philoct. 706; Eurip. Androm. 379; *Elmsley*, Eurip. Med. p. 155 Lips.; *Schaeff.* Demosth. I. 225, 465, 587, 591; II. 266, 327, 481, 492, 568; III. 288, 299; IV. 258; V. 730; *Stallb.* Plat. Phaed. p. 43, 144. (The theory of *Hermann* is combated on the ground of *Thiersch's* principles by *Hartung*, Lehre von den griech. Partik. II. 73 ff., and he is followed by *Rost*, Gramm. 743; in the main, however, he at last agrees with *Herm.*, and the doubt through which he was led to his views has been solved by *Klotz*, Devar. II. 666. *G. F. Gayler's* essay, particular. gr. sermonis negantium accurata disputatio, Tubing. 1836. 8vo., is an industrious collection of examples, but is deficient in clearness.) On the difference between *non* and *haud* in Latin see *Franke* I. 7 sq., the review in Hall. L. Z. 1834. no. 145, and *Hand*, Tursell. III. 16 ff. (who at the same time explains οὐ as the qualitative, μή as the modal negation). The comparison of the Heb. כִּי with μή (*Ewald*, 530) can be less perfectly carried through; precisely in the more delicate relations the correspondence fails.

² That the N. T. authors observed almost invariably this in itself delicate difference, is due not to their theoretical knowledge, but to the sense of propriety they acquired by much intercourse with those who spoke Greek; precisely as we also learn the sometimes conventional difference between the synonyms of our mother tongue. In particular instances, however, a foreigner might well be expected to err, since even *Plutarch* (*Schaeff.* Demosth. III. 289; *Plutarch.* V. 6, 142, 475), *Lucian* (*Schaeff.* Demosth. I. 529; *Schoemann*, *Plutarch.* Agis p. 93; *Fritzsche*, *question.* *Lucian.* p. 44), *Pausan.* (*Franke*, I. 14), *Aelian* (*Jacobs*, *Ael. anim.* p. 187), cf. *Mdv.* 245; *Mth.* 1444, are said to have sometimes interchanged the two negatives. Cf. also on ὅτι μή for ὅτι οὐ *Ellendt*, praef. ad *Arrian.* I. 24 sq. I would not, however, assert that in these passages grammatical acuteness might not repeatedly be able to discover the reason for οὐ or μή;

a. From the examination of a few passages in which the two negatives occur *together*. Jno. iii. 18 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται, 442 ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν etc. (cf. Hm. as 7th ed. above 805); κρίνεσθαι is denied as matter of fact by οὐ, i.e. it is asserted that in fact a judgment does not take place. The second πιστεύων, however, is negatived by the particle μὴ merely as a 496 supposed case, for ὁ μὴ πιστ. means, *who (ever) does not believe*, 421 *if one does not believe* (ὁ οὐ πιστεύων would indicate a definite individual who does not believe); hence follows also ὅτι μὴ πεπίστ., since a case is merely supposed (quod non crediderit). This usage is not contradicted by 1 Jno. v. 10 ὁ μὴ πιστεύων τῷ θεῷ ψεύστην πεποίηκεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν etc. Here the apostle in the last words passes suddenly from the mere supposition (ὁ μὴ πιστ.) to the matter of fact: the μὴ πιστεύων had already begun, and John pictures to himself now an actual unbeliever.

Mark xii. 14 ἔξεστι κῆνσον . . . δοῦναι ἢ οὐ; δῶμεν, ἢ μὴ δῶμεν; where, in the first instance, inquiry is made as to the objective reason for paying tribute; in the second, a subjective principle is expressed: *are (ought) we to give* etc. Cf. Hm. Vig. 806, on Aristoph. Thesmoph. 19, and Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 270.

Eph. v. 15 βλέπετε πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε, μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί; the μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι etc. is the direct explanation of πῶς, and like that dependent on βλέπετε,—hence the subjective negation.

2 Cor. x. 14 οὐ γάρ, ὥς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτοὺς *we do not overstretch ourselves* (objectively negatived), *as though we had not reached to you*, a mere supposition; in point of fact it is not so. Cf., on the other hand, 1 Cor. ix. 26.

Rom. xi. 21 εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μὴ πως οὐδὲ σοὺ φείσεται *if God spared not (matter of fact, he has in reality not spared them), so (it is to be feared) lest he also spare not thee*. Here the apostle might have uttered the sentence categorically, *so will he also not spare thee*; but he prefers to give it a milder turn by using μὴ πως: lest perhaps οὐδὲ σοὺ φείσεται become true; and every apprehension is subjective (Rev. ix. 4). Cf. Plat. Phaed. 76 b. φοβούμαι, μὴ αὔριον τηνικάδε οὐκέτι ἢ ἀνθρώπων οὐδεὶς ἀξίως οἷός τε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, p. 84 b. οὐδὲν δεινόν, μὴ φοβηθῇ, ὅπως μὴ . . . οὐδὲν ἔτι οὐδαμοῦ ᾗ, Thuc. 2, 76; see Gayler pp. 427, 430.

while we must never forget that sometimes there is no stringent reason in favor of *οὐ* or *μὴ*, but either negative may be used according to the author's view of the case, Hm. Vig. 806.

1 Jno. v. 16 *ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον . . . πᾶσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστὶ καὶ ἔστιν ἁμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον* (in the former clause *μή* is used as following up a subjective observation and dependent on *ἐάν ἴδῃ*, in the latter *οὐ*, since an objectively valid principle is asserted, an idea dogmatically real is laid down).

Jno. vi. 64 *εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες, οἳ οὐ πιστεύουσιν· ἦδει γὰρ . . . ὁ Ἰησ., τίνες εἰσὶν οἳ μὴ πιστεύοντες*, the former clause conveying a matter of fact, the second a supposition, *who they were that would not believe*, *qui essent, qui non crederent*. Cf. besides Rom. v. 13; 497 Jno. v. 23; xiv. 24; xv. 24; Acts iv. 20; x. 14; xxv. 17 f; 1 Jno. iv. 8; v. 12; 3 Jno. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 10; Gal. iv. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 13; 443 Heb. iv. 2, 15.¹ 7th ed.

b. But the same result which these passages give follows also 422 from those in which *μή* occurs alone: Matt. xxii. 25 *μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα ἀφήκε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ*, where *μὴ ἔχων* is used with reference to the law that made this provision (*ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων* etc. vs. 24): not having, he left behind etc., as one not having in the sense of the law, he left etc. (*οὐκ ἔχων* would exhibit the not having as if narrating something purely a matter of fact); in Mark xii. 20 we find in the narrative form *οὐκ ἀφήκε σπέρμα*. Col. i. 23 *εἶγε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει . . . καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπ.*, where the *not being moved away* (in a proposition beginning with *εἶγε*) is put as a condition, consequently as something only supposed. 2 Thess. i. 8 *διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι θεὸν καὶ τοῖς μὴ ὑπακούουσι τῷ εὐαγγ.*; the statement here is general: such as know not God, whoever they are, wherever such are to be found (consequently a supposition), cf. ii. 12. Rom. xiv. 21 *καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα* (the not eating as something supposed: *if any one eat not*; τὸ οὐ φαγεῖν would represent the not

¹ Passages from Greek authors in which *οὐ* and *μή* appear together in the same main proposition, with more or less obvious difference, are e.g. Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 1, 3, 63 *ταῦτα οὐκ ἀπολογουμένου ἦν, ἀλλὰ κακοῖς ἐπιπληροῦντος κακὰ καὶ μηκέτι μετρίως, ἀλλὰ ἔρῃην ἐπισπωμένου τὰς ἀπορίας*, 2, 60 *λεκτόν, ὥς εἰ μὴδὲν ἐστὶ ρητορικῆς τέλους, οὐδὲν ἐστὶ ρητορικῆς* (2, 107), 2, 110; hypotyp. 3, 1, 2; Lucian. catapl. 15 *ἐγὼ δὲ μὴδὲν ἔχων ἐνέχυρον ἐν τῷ βίῳ, οὐκ ἀγρόν, οὐ συνοικίαν, οὐ χρυσόν* etc. Soph. Antig. 686 *οὐτ' ἂν δυνάμην, μήτ' ἐπιστάμην λέγειν*, Philoct. 1048; Demosth. Callicl. 736 b.; pac. 23 a.; Phorm. 604 a.; Xen. C. 2, 4, 27; Aristot. polit. 6, 8; rhet. 1, 11, 31; 2, 2, and 15; Lucian. dial. mort. 16, 2; adv. indoct. 5; Strabo 3, 138; 15, 712; Himer. oratt. 23, 18; Plutarch. Pompej. 23; apophth. p. 183 f.; Aelian. anim. 5, 28; Joseph. Antt. 16, 9, 3. Cf. besides, Gayler p. 291. From the Fathers, cf. Origen c. Marc. p. 26 *Wetst.*; from the apocrypha, Acta apocr. p. 107. Particularly noteworthy is Agath. 2, 23 *ἐφ' ὅτῃ ἂν σώματι μὴ θάττον καταπατῆεν οἱ ὄρνεις ἢ οἱ κύνες οὐκ αὐτίκα ἐπιφοιτῶντες διασπαράττειν* etc.

eating as something objective, — an actually existing practice it may be). Rom. xv. 1 ὁφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς . . . καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν (vs. 3 narratively: καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν). Hence, naturally, with the Optative when a mere wish is expressed (Franke I. 27), Mark xi. 14 μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι (yet some Codd. read here φάγη), 2 Tim. iv. 16; and in Imperative sentences, Rom. xiv. 1 τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσ-
 498 λαμβάνεσθε, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν (xii. 11); Phil. ii. 12, where some erroneously refer the words μὴ ὡς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ etc. to ὑπηκούσατε, in which case οὐ would have been indispensable.

In accordance with the difference above defined, μή in general will express the weaker (cf. also Hm. Philoct. 706), and οὐ, as categorical, the stronger negation. Nevertheless μή is also at times more emphatic than οὐ (Hm. Soph. Antig. 691), inasmuch as, if
 444 (even) the supposition is denied, more is expressed than if the
 7th ed. actual existence of a thing (as a fact) is denied. See under no. 5. In like manner is the Latin *haud* sometimes the stronger, sometimes the weaker negation, Franke I. 7; cf. Hand, Tursell. III. 20.

Where οὐ belongs to a single word (verb) to which in the language there is a negative directly antagonistic, it coalesces with that word and expresses this exactly contrary idea, as οὐκ ἔαν *to prevent* Acts xvi. 7, οὐ
 423 θέλειν *nolle* 1 Cor. x. 1. See Franke I. 9 sq., cf. under no. 6. Οὐ combined
 6th ed. with nouns into one idea obliterates their meaning altogether: Rom. x. 19 παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει *over a no-nation*, ix. 25 καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἡγαπημένην ἡγαπημένην, 1 Pet. ii. 10 — (all quotations from O. T.); cf. Thuc. 1, 137 ἡ οὐ διάλυσις *the not breaking* (the bridge had not been broken), 5, 50 ἡ οὐκ ἐξουσία, Eurip. Hippol. 196 οὐκ ἀπόδειξις, see Monk in loc.; Sturz, ind. ad Dion. Cass. p. 245; Fr. Rom. II. 424. How this combination differs from that with μή (ἡ μὴ διάλυσις), see Franke, as above, I. 9. Numerous examples of both in Gayler p. 16 sqq.

The simple, accented, οὐ *no* (Matt. v. 37; Jas. v. 12; 2 Cor. i. 17 f.) occurs in answer to a question only in Matt. xiii. 29; Jno. i. 21, (for instances from Greek writers, see Gayler p. 161); the fuller form οὐκ ἔγωγε would have been more usual.

2. Let us consider now those cases, the most frequent of all, in which a negation is expressed by μή; this takes place:

a. In (wishes) commands, resolutions, encouragements, and that not only with verbs of the sort, that is to say Imperatives and Subjunctives, Matt. vii. 1 μὴ κρίνετε, Gal. v. 26 μὴ γνωμέθα κενόδοξοι, 2 Thess. iii. 10, see § 56, 1, but also with words which are

considered as integral parts of the command, etc., 1 Pet. v. 2 *ποιμάνετε . . . μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς*, 1 Pet. i. 13 f.; 1 Tim. v. 9; Luke vi. 35; 1 Cor. v. 8; Rom. xiii. 13; Phil. ii. 4, 12; Heb. x. 25; Acts x. 20.

b. In telic clauses, with *ἵνα* Matt. vii. 1; xvi. 20; Rom. xi. 25; Eph. ii. 9; Heb. xii. 3; Mark v. 43; 2 Cor. v. 15; vii. 9; Eph. 499 iv. 14, or *ὅπως* Luke xvi. 26; 1 Cor. i. 29; Matt. vi. 18; Acts viii. 24; xx. 16. So also with single words of such clauses, Rom. viii. 4; Eph. ii. 12 [?]; Phil. i. 27 f.; iii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. xii. 27.

c. In conditional sentences (Hm. Vig. 805), with *εἰ* Jno. xv. 22 *εἰ μὴ ἦλθον, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχουσιν*, xviii. 30 *εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος κακὸν ποιῶν, οὐκ ἂν σοι παρεδώκαμεν*, Matt. xxiv. 22; Acts xxvi. 32; Rom. vii. 7; Jno. ix. 33, and with *ἐάν* Matt. v. 20; xii. 29; Rom. x. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 5, not only with reference to the whole proposition, but also with single words which are considered as conditional, 1 Tim. v. 21; Tit. i. 6 *εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος . . . μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας*, ii. 8; Jas. i. 4, 26.

In all these cases the necessity of the subjective negation is clear; for every condition, design, purpose, command, falls within the province of what is merely conceived of.

In conditional sentences *οὐ* occurs not infrequently; in the N. T. 445 pretty often, in the older writers with logical necessity only where but a single word of the conditional sentence (hardly the *verb* merely Krü. 271) is negated, so that the negation coalesces with this word into a single idea, Hm. Vig. 833; Eurip. Med. p. 344; Soph. Oed. C. 596; Schaef. Plut. IV. 396¹; Mehlhorn, Anacr. p. 139; Bremi, Lys. p. 111; Schoemann, Isae. p. 324 sq.; e.g. 424 Soph. Aj. 1131 *εἰ τοὺς θανόντας οὐκ ἔαθ' ἰσχύειν ἵφ' τοῦ hinderest* 614 ed. (Iliad. 4, 55), Lys. Agor. 62 *εἰ μὲν οὐ πολλοὶ (i.e. ὀλίγοι) ἦσαν*, Thuc. 3, 55 *εἰ ἀποστήναι Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἠθελήσαμεν*, Her. 6, 9. Cf. Gayl. p. 99 sqq.; Mtth. 1440; Krü. 271. (On the analogous *ὅπως οὐ* see Held, Plut. Timol. 357.) According to this there is nothing strange in Matt. xxvi. 42; Luke xvi. 31; Jno. v. 47; Rom. viii. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 10, 14; 1 Tim. iii. 5; v. 8; Rev. xx. 15, etc., and as little in 2 Cor. xii. 11 *εἰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰμι*.

On the other hand, Lipsius (de modor. in N. T. usu p. 26 sqq.) has adduced a number of other passages, which contradict the

¹ Schaef. Demosth. III. 288: *οὐ* poni licet, quando negatio refertur ad sequentem vocem cum eaque sic coalescit, unam ut ambae notionem efficiant; *μὴ* ponitur, quando negatio pertinet ad particulam conditionalem. Cf. Rost, Gr. S. 745.

above canon, or appear to do so; since, indeed, generally in the N. T. *if not* is expressed more frequently by *εἰ οὐ* than by *εἰ μή*, which latter phrase most commonly signifies *except*.¹ We divide 500 these passages into four classes:

a) Such as have nothing to do with the question: Luke xii. 26 *εἰ οὐδὲ ἐλάχιστον δύνασθῇ, τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε*; for *εἰ* here is conditional only in appearance; in reality it is equivalent to *ἐπεὶ*, Krü. 271. Translate *if* (as is clear from the alleged cases), i.e. *since you cannot do even the least* etc. (hence always *θαυμάζω εἰ οὐ* cf. Kühner II. 406). So also Rom. xi. 21; Jno. iii. 12; v. 47; x. 35; Heb. xii. 25; 2 Pet. ii. 4; cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 596 *εἰ θέλοντάς γ' οὐδὲ σοὶ φεύγειν καλόν σι, quum te volunt recipere, ne tibi quidem decorum est exsulem esse*, and Aeschin. ep. 8 *εἰ δὲ οὐδὲ σὺν ἐκείνῳ διέγνωκας ἐξιέναι* etc., Sext. Empir. Math. 7, 434 *εἰ οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἥδει* etc. Xenoph. A. 7, 1, 29; Aesop. 23, 2, see Bhdy. 386; Franke, Demosth. p. 202; Gayl. 118; Hm. Aeschyl. II. 148.

b) Such as, when viewed more closely, are in unison with the above canon: not only 1 Cor. xi. 6 *εἰ γὰρ οὐ κατακαλύπτεται γυνή, καὶ κειράσθω if a woman is unveiled, she ought also to be shorn*, 2 Thess. iii. 10, but also Jno. x. 37 *εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς μου, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι· εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε if I omit the works of my Father (and thus withhold from you the proofs of my divine mission) etc.; but if I do them etc.*, Jno. iii. 12; Rom. viii. 9; Rev. xx. 15; cf. Lys. accus. Agor. 446 76 *ἐὰν μὲν οὖν φάσκη Φρόνιχον ἀποκτείνειν, τούτων μέμνησθε . . . ἐὰν 7th ed. δ' οὐ φάσκη, ἔρεσθε αὐτόν etc. but if he denies it*, Sext. Empir. Math. 2, 111 *εἰ μὲν λήμματά τινα ἔχει . . . εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει etc. but if he is destitute of them*, 9, 176 *εἰ μὲν οὐκ ἔχει, φαῦλόν ἐστι τὸ θεῖον . . . εἰ δὲ ἔχει, ἔσται τι τοῦ θεοῦ κρείττον*, hypotyp. 2, 5. 160. 175; Lucian. paras. 12; Galen. temper. 1, 3; Mr. Anton. 11, 18 p. 193 Mor. (cf. also Euseb. de die dom. p. 9 Jani). Nor is there anything to object against 1 Cor. xv. 13: *εἰ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστι if the resurrection of the dead is a chimera*, etc.; cf. in the preceding context *πῶς λέγουσιν τινες ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν*; On vs. 16 cf. Philostr. Apoll. 4, 16, p. 154.

c) Cases in which the proposition with *εἰ οὐ* merely negatives 425 the idea which is expressed affirmatively in a corresponding proposition, without the *οὐ* coalescing with the negated word into a 6th ed.

¹ *εἰ οὐ* and *εἰ μή* are well distinguished in a single sentence in Acta Thom. p. 57 ed. Thilo.

single opposed idea: 1 Cor. ix. 2 *εἰ ἄλλοις οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλὰ γε ὑμῖν εἰμι*, si aliis non sum apostolus, vobis certe sum. Luke xi. 8, cf. xviii. 4. But even in such oppositions later writers use *εἰ οὐ*, e.g. Sext. Empir. Math. 11, 5 *εἰ μὲν ἀγαθὸν ἔστιν, ἐν τῶν τριῶν γενήσεται, εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθόν, ἤτοι κακὸν ἔστιν, ἢ οὔτε κακὸν ἔστιν οὔτε ἀγαθὸν ἔστιν*, Diog. L. 2, 36 *εἰ μὲν γάρ τι τῶν προσόντων λέξειαν, διορθώσονται, εἰ δ' οὐ, οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, where the sense is 501 not: if, however, they *be silent* about it, but, if they do *not* say something useful,¹ cf. Judg. ix. 20; Judith v. 21; Demosth. epp. p. 125 a.; Basilic. II. 525, and Poppo Xen. Anab. p. 358.

d) Cases in which *οὐ* likewise antithetically denies, without, however, an express affirmative proposition preceding: Jas. ii. 11 *εἰ οὐ μοιχεύσεις* (with reference to the preceding *μὴ μοιχεύσης*), *φονεύσεις δέ, γέγονας παραβάτης νόμου* *if thou dost not commit adultery, yet if thou killest*,² i. 23; iii. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 22 *εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα* (where the rendering, *if any one hateth the Lord*, would probably not represent the apostle's meaning); 2 Jno. 10 *εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει*, Luke xiv. 26.

For the later prose writers, then, who in general use *εἰ οὐ* (as the stronger and more expressive form) much oftener than the older writers (who were rather frugal in its use), we may state the rule thus (cf. also Anton, Progr. de discrim. particul. *οὐ* et *μή*, Gorlic. 1823, 4to. p. 9): where *not* in a conditional proposition is emphatic,³ *εἰ οὐ* (as in Latin *si non*) is used; but where *if not* stands without emphasis on the negation, *εἰ μή* (as in Latin *nisi*): 447 e.g. if thou dost *not* commit adultery (with reference to the preceding *μὴ μοιχ.*), if any man loveth *not* the Lord (as he ought), if I am *not* an apostle unto others, Jno. i. 25 if thou art *not* the Christ, cf. vs. 20. The emphasis is brought out by an antithesis, either open (1 Cor. ix. 2)⁴ or concealed (1 Cor. xvi. 22). It lies, however, in the nature of the case that *οὐ* then negatives only a *part* of the conditional proposition, not the proposition itself.

¹ Macar. homil. 1, 10. Cf. also *ἐάν* Diog. L. 1, 105 *ἐάν νέος ᾖν τὸν οἶνον οὐ φέρῃς, γέμων γενόμενος ὕδρι οἴσεις*.

² Equivalent to *εἰ οὐ μοιχεύων ἔσθι, φονεύων δέ*, cf. Arrian. Epict. 1, 29, 35; 2, 11, 22. On the contrary, Thuc. 1, 32 *εἰ μή μετὰ κακίας, δόξης δὲ μᾶλλον ἀμαρτία . . . ἐναντία τολμῶμεν*.

³ Mehlhorn, as above, gives the rule: ubi simpliciter negatio affirmationi ita opponatur, ut negandi part. voce sit acuenda, semper *οὐ* poni, ubi contra verbum voce inprimis, notandum *μή* esse debere. Cf. also Poppo on Xen. Anab. as above.

⁴ Cf. also e.g. Aesop. 7, 4 *εἰ οὐ σοὶ τοῦτο προσέφερον, οὐκ ἂν ἡμῖν αὐτὸ συμβούλευες* if it were not useful to thee, thou wouldst not advise us to it.

ὅστε (Krü. p. 272 f.) of a consequence even when represented as mere matter of fact is used in the N. T. always with μή and the Infinitive, Matt. viii. 28; Mark i. 45; ii. 2; iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Thess. i. 8. Only in 2 Cor. iii. 7 is there a logical ground for it in the conditional proposition; Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 219.

426 After ὅτι and ἐπεὶ because (in direct discourse) οὐ follows regularly, Jno. viii. 20, 37; Rom. xi. 6; Luke i. 34; Bäumlein S. 773; ὅτι μή in conditional discourse occurs in Jno. iii. 18. On the contrary, we have in Heb. ix. 17, in direct discourse, διαθήκη ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει, ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθίμενος, which Böhme explains thus: μήποτε seems here to negative even the idea of ἰσχύειν; consequently in general to deny more strongly than οὐποτε. Yet Böhme's rendering of μήποτε by *nondum* is erroneous; it means, *never, never at all* (Heliod. 2, 19). And perhaps the author gave the preference to μήποτε on this account also, because he is speaking in general terms and not of any particular testament. However, in later authors the subjective negation frequently occurs in connection with ἐπεὶ (ὅτι) *quandoquidem*, not only where something is clearly designated as a subjective reason (as is perceptible even in Aelian. 12, 63; cf. besides, Philostr. Apoll. 7, 16; Lucian. Hermot. 47), but also where an objectively valid reason is assigned (Gayl. 183 sqq.; Mdv. p. 245; on Lucian and Arrian in particular, Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. praefat. p. 23 sqq., cf. also Ptol. geogr. 8, 1, 3), in so far as the reason falls back at last on a supposition. Others (Bengel, Lchm.) take μήποτε in Heb., as above, as an interrogative, as indeed ἐπεὶ often introduces a question, Rom. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; xv. 29; Klotz, Devar. p. 543. This seems to me, however, to be too rhetorical for the style.

3. e. In relative clauses with ἄν (ἐάν), Luke viii. 18 δὲ ἄν μὴ ἔχη, Acts iii. 23 (Sept.) πάντα ψυχῇ, ἥτις ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ, Rev. xiii. 15 ὅσοι ἄν μὴ προσκυνήσωσιν, Luke ix. 5. In all these cases nothing is denied as a matter of fact of particular subjects, but the language is only conditional and supposed: whoever hath not (may not have). Relative clauses without ἄν have regularly οὐ, Jno. iv. 22 προσκυνεῖτε δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε, Luke xiv. 27 ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει, Rom. x. 14; 1 Cor. v. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 10; 1 Jno. iv. 6, etc., so far forth as they deny something as matter of fact; on the other hand, 448 μὴ occurs sometimes in such cases when the negation refers only 7th ed. to a supposition (assumption, condition) (Hm. Vig. 805; Krü. 271), 2 Pet. i. 9 ὃ μὴ πάρεστι ταῦτα, τυφλὸς ἐστὶν *whoso lacketh, if any man lack*, etc. In 1 Tim. v. 13; Tit. i. 11 τὰ μὴ δέοντα and ἃ μὴ δεῖ (cf. Rom. i. 28; Soph. Phil. 583) express merely a moral conception: *quae, si quae non sunt honesta*; whereas ἃ οὐ δεῖ would denote positively *inhonesta*, the kind of unseemly things objectively present, cf. Gayl. 240 f. In Col. ii. 18 μὴ before

ἐώρακεν¹ is expunged by the more recent critics; only Tisch. in the 2d [and 7th] Leipzig ed. restores it, and undoubtedly it has 503 the greatest amount of external authority on its side (Mey. states the authorities imperfectly). If the negation [which is wanting, moreover, in Cod. Sin.*] be genuine (some authorities have οὐ), μὴ must be used because even the relative clause is viewed by 427 Paul subjectively, as μηδεὶς ὑμ. καταβῆβαυέντω.² 6th ed.

Frequently ὅς is followed by οὐ, where, since apparently a mere supposition is uttered, some have expected μὴ (Lipsius de modis p. 14), as in Matt. xxiv. 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, ὅς οὐ καταλυθήσεται (but here μὴ is not indispensable, inasmuch as the words deny a matter of fact); and also where in Latin the Subjunctive would stand, and therefore μὴ would have been expected, Matt. x. 26 οὐδὲν ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, Luke viii. 17; xii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 2; cf. 1 Kings viii. 46. For instances from Greek authors (Hm. Vig. p. 709) see Eur. Hel. 509 sq. ἀνὴρ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε . . . ὅς . . . οὐ δώσει βοράν, Lucian. sacrif. 1 οὐκ οἶδα, εἴ τις οὕτω κατηγορῆς ἐστι, ὅστις οὐ γελᾷσεται, Soph. Oed. R. 374 οὐδεὶς ὅς οὐχὶ τῶνδ' ὀνειδιεῖ τάχα. In all these cases the relative clause is considered as a definite, objective predicate, as if it were said ἀνὴρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε οὐ δώσει βοράν; even in construction with the Optative, Isocr. Evagor. p. 452 οὐκ ἐστίν, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν Αἰακίδος προκρίνειεν, also p. 199; Plut. apophth. p. 196 c. Closely allied to this is the phrase τίς ἐστω, ὅς οὐ followed by the Pres. indic. Acts xix. 35; Heb. xii. 7; cf. Dion. comp. 11 ed. Schaef. p. 120, which in sense is equivalent to οὐδεὶς ἐστω, ὅς οὐ (for which Strabo 6, 286 has οὐδὲν μέρος αὐτῆς ἐστω, ὃ μὴ . . . τυγχάνει); on the other hand, οὐδεὶς ἐστω, ὅς οὐ with the Preterite, is beyond the range of those cases in which one would expect μὴ, Xen. An. 4, 5, 31; Thuc. 3, 81; Lucian. Tox. 22; asin. 49; cf. Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 233; Weber, Demosth. 356 sq. See also Gayl. p. 257 sqq., who, it must be confessed, has not discriminated sufficiently.

4. f. With Infinitives (Mtth. 1442; Krü. 273), not only such as depend on a verb of *thinking, speaking, commanding, wishing* (of 449 course also in the construction of the Accusative with the Infinitive) 7th ed. Matt. ii. 12; v. 34, 39; Luke ii. 26; v. 14; xx. 7; xxi. 14; Acts iv. 17 f. 20; v. 28; x. 28; xv. 19, 38; xix. 31; xxi. 4; xxiii. 8; xxvii. 21; Rom. ii. 21 f; xii. 3; xiii. 3; 1 Cor. v. 9, 11;

¹ Cf. Philostr. Apoll. 7, 27 διελέγετο & μὴ θκείνω προῖβαινε quae illi laud prodessent. From the Sept. may be adduced Exod. ix. 21 ὅς μὴ προσέσχε τῇ διανοίᾳ εἰς τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου in opposition to ὃ φοβούμενος τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου vs. 20; thus just like εἰ δὲ μὴ in antithesis. Οὐ and μὴ after relat. in parallel propositions, see Arrian. Epict. 2, 2, 4.

² In propositions with particles of time (Gayler, p. 185 sqq.) μὴ does not happen to occur in the N. T.; several times οὐ is quite regularly joined to the Indicative of time, Jno. ix. 4; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Acts xxii. 11.

2 Cor. ii. 1; x. 2; Heb. ix. 8, etc., or by which a design is expressed 2 Cor. iv. 4 ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα . . . εἰς τὸ μὴ αἰγάζσαι, 1 Thess. ii. 9 ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι, Acts xx. 27 οὐκ
 504 ἡπεστειλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι, 1 Pet. iv. 2, — but also where the Infinitive is the subject of a proposition, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρεῖττον ἢ αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι, Luke xvii. 1, or, being joined to a proposition, is resolvable into a finite verb with οὐ, Jas. iv. 2 οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς (ὅτι οὐκ αἰτεῖσθε ἑμείς), Luke viii. 6; Acts xxviii. 18; Heb. x. 2. But in that first case ἐπεγνωκ. is denied only as a supposition (in fact they had known), and in the second the cause is represented not objectively, but as primarily the thought of the speaker. Precedents from the classics for all
 428 this, see in Gayler 294 sqq.; cf. Rost 750; Bäumlein nr. 99, S. 788 f. Also those parts of speech which belong essentially to the Infinitive clause are negated by μή, e.g. 2 Cor. x. 2.

The cases in the Infinitive construction in which οὐ is, and can or must be, used have been pointed out by Rost 747 f.; Krü. 274; Bäumlein S. 778. In Jno. xxi. 25 ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἐν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφ. βιβλία the negation belongs to οἶμαι, cf. Xen. M. 2, 2, 10 ἐγὼ μὲν οἶμαι, εἰ τοιαύτην μὴ δύνασθαι φέρειν μητέρα, ἀγαθὰ σε οὐ δύνασθαι φέρειν. In Heb. vii. 11 τίς ἐτι χρεῖα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδ. ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν λέγεσθαι the negation does not belong to the Infinitive, but negatives the words κατὰ τ. τάξιν. Ἀαρ. Οὐ is often in dependent clauses joined thus to a single word, Krü. S. 270.

• When after a verb of *understanding* or *saying*, in direct discourse etc., the assertion, observation etc. is expressed in a clause with ὅτι, the negation is made by οὐ, Luke xiv. 24 λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν . . . γεύσεται τοῦ δείπνου, xviii. 29; Jno. v. 42 ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε etc., viii. 55; Acts ii. 81 etc. The proposition with ὅτι stands here as a pure objective proposition just as in indirect question (§ 41, 4), as if it were οὐδεὶς . . . γεύσεται, τοῦτο ὑμῖν λέγω, while the Infinitive construction brings it into immediate connection with, and consequently dependence on, λέγω, ὁρῶ etc. Cf. Krü. 253, 270; Mdv. 235.

5. g. With Participles (Gayl. 274 sqq.; Krü. 274 f.) μή is used not only when they belong to a proposition which, as expressing command, design, condition, etc., requires the subjective negation (see no. 2), Eph. v. 27; Phil. i. 28; ii. 4; iii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. vi. 1; Jas. i. 5; Tit. ii. 9 f.; Rom. viii. 4; xiv. 3; Matt. xxii. 24; Acts xv. 38; Luke iii. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 21; cf. Soph. Oed.

C. 1155, 980; Plato, rep. 2, 370 e.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 26; Krü. 273, 450
— but also under other circumstances: 7th ed.

a. when they refer, not to particular persons, but to a supposed 505
genus: Matt. xii. 30 ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν *he who is not with me* i.e. whoever belongs to this class of men that I have in mind, *si quis non stet a meis partibus*, Hm. Vig. 805; Mtth. 1441 sq.; Krü. 174 (ὁ οὐκ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ would mean a particular individual who actually was not with him), Matt. xxv. 29; Luke vi. 49; Jno. x. 1; xii. 48; xx. 24 [?]; Rom. iv. 5; xiv. 22; Jas. ii. 13; iv. 17; 1 Jno. ii. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 37; hence with πᾶς Matt. xiii. 19; Jno. xv. 2. Also 2 Jno. 7 πολλοὶ πλάνοι εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον οἱ μὴ ὁμολογούντες Ἰησοῦν Χρ. etc. belongs here; the words do not mean many deceivers — namely, those who do not confess (οἱ οὐχ ὁμολ.) — but, many deceivers, all those who do not confess, quicunque non profitentur.

β. when they apply to particular persons indeed, but ascribe to them a quality only conditionally or in thought: Luke xi. 24 ὅταν ... ἐξέλθῃ ... διέρχεται δι' ἀνδρῶν τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπανσιν, καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον λέγει ἵf *he finds it not, in case he does not* etc., Rom. ii. 14; Gal. vi. 9 θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι, Luke xii. 47 ἐκεῖνος ὁ δοῦλος (vs. 45 f.) ὁ μὴ ἐτοιμάσας μηδὲ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα δαρή- 429 σεται (this is propounded as one of two possible cases); 1 Cor. 6th ed. x. 33 πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω, μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαντοῦ συμφέρον *I seek to please all*, (supposition) *as one who, inasmuch as I* etc., ix. 21; 2 Cor. vi. 3; Rom. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iii. 1, 5 (against Rückert see Lünemann in loc.); Jno. vii. 15 πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδε μὴ μεμαθηκώς; since he can't have learned (since we, surely, know him to be such a one as has never learned? cf. Philostr. Apoll. 3, 22 ὃς καὶ γράφει μὴ μαθὼν γράμματα). Luke vii. 33 ἐλήλυθεν Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων ἄρτον μήτε πίνων οἶνον *without having eaten ... drunken* (spoken from the position of those who, observing this, are introduced as saying so); οὔτε ἐσθίων οὔτε πίνων would express the predicates as pure matters of fact. In Luke iv. 35 τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάβαν αὐτόν, by the last words the author does not mean to relate a mere matter of fact (οὐδὲν βλάβ. αὐτόν *and did not harm him*), but to exclude merely the thought that the evil spirit had in any way injured the possessed: *he had not* (as one might perhaps have thought) *injured him*.

Thus μὴ is very often to be understood: Acts v. 7; xx. 22; Heb. iv. 15; xi. 8; Matt. xxii. 12. Cf. what Klotz says, Devar. p. 666: quibus in locis omnibus propterea μὴ positum est, non οὐ,

quod ille, qui loquitur, non rem ipsam spectat sed potius cogitationem rei, quam vult ex animo audientis amovere (Plut. Pompej. 506 c. 64); Hm. Vig. 806. In Matt. xviii. 25 *μὴ ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ παρῆναι* etc. the first words express a *fact*, indeed, *as he had not*; but in this construction they 451 are put in close relation with *ἐκέλ.*: *he commanded, because that* 7th ed. *man had not*, because he knew that the man had not, etc. So also Acts xxi. 34; Luke ii. 45; xxiv. 23; Acts ix. 26; xiii. 28; xvii. 6; xxvii. 7, 20; 1 Pet. iv. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9; cf. Plut. Pompej. c. 23 and Alex. 51; Polyb. 17, 7, 5; 5, 30, 5. On Rom. ix. 11 see Fr. Acts xx. 29 *οἶδα ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται . . . λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου* is, as the Future shows, to be taken altogether as an ideal picture. Also Heb. ix. 9 *μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι* etc. is spoken in the view of the writer; had it been *οὐ δυνάμ.* an actual inherent property would have been signified (*not being able*), but such offerings Israelites would not have presented. 1 Cor. i. 28 *ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ*, where *τὰ οὐκ ὄντα* would signify (Hm. Vig. 889) *the non-existing* (as a single negative idea), but *τὰ μὴ ὄντα* must mean *which were reckoned as things that did not exist*; the *ὄντα* is negated as a supposition, not spoken actually of *nonentities*.¹ In 2 Cor. iv. 18 (even in the second proposition, which is categorical) to *τὰ βλεπόμενα* stands opposed *τὰ μὴ βλεπ.*, not *τὰ οὐ βλεπ.* (Heb. xi. 1). This last would denote what actually is not seen 430 8th ed. (*τὰ ἀόρατα*), but *τὰ μὴ βλεπ.* expresses, in conjunction with *μὴ σκοποῦντων ἡμῶν*, the *subjective* view of the believer, cf. Heb. xi. 7. Also in 2 Cor. v. 21 *τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε*, the *μὴ. γν.* carries us back to the conception of him who makes him *ἁμαρτία*; *τὸν οὐ γνόντα* would be objective and equivalent to *τὸν ἀγνοοῦντα*,² Isae. 1, 11 and Schoem. in loc. 2 Cor. vi. 3 does not read *οὐδεμίαν ἐν οὐδενὶ διδόντες προσκοπήν*, because this would exhibit merely an actually existing characteristic, but *μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ διδ. πρ.* because the characteristic is regarded, in connection with *παρακαλοῦμεν* vs. 1, as subjectively adhered to and continually striven after. Cf. besides, Luke vii. 30; Jno. vii. 49; 1 Cor. ix. 20 f. So with *ὥς* in subjective speech, 1 Cor. iv. 7 *τί κενχᾶσαι ὥς μὴ λαβών*; iv. 18; vii. 29; 2 Cor. x. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 16; Gayler 278 sq. (otherwise 1 Cor. ix. 26, see below).

¹ *Μὴ ὄντα* and *οὐκ ὄντα* are united in Xen. An. 4, 4, 15.

² The remark of Rückert on this passage, that in Greek *οὐ* never stands between the article and participle but always *μὴ*, is wholly empirical, and false besides, and has been properly refuted by Mey.

On the other hand, *οὐ* with participles (and adjectives) — with which it occurs far less frequently — negatives actually and without qualification (Gayl. 287 sq.; Mtth. 1442), and hence stands especially with predicates which are denied of definite persons: ¹ Phil. iii. 3 *ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι θεῷ λατρεύοντες ... 452*
καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες (the *ἡμεῖς*, since they actually are ^{7th ed.} πνεύμ. θεῷ λατρ., are denied to be ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες); 1 Pet. 507
 ii. 10 *ὑμεῖς ... οἱ οὐκ ἐλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες*, Rom. ix. 25
 (LXX.); Heb. xi. 35 *ἔλαβον γυναῖκες ... ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν*
οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν (*not accepting*, i.e. disdaining);
 Col. ii. 19 *εἰκὴ φυσιοῦμενος ... καὶ οὐ κρατῶν*, although the sen-
 tence is imperative (vs. 18 *μηδεὶς ὑμῶς καταβραβεύετω* and *ἂ μὴ*
ἐώρακεν etc.), yet with *οὐ κρατ.* the apostle passes over to a pred-
 icate actually existing, Acts xvii. 27; Luke vi. 42; 1 Cor. ix. 26
ἐγὼ οὕτω πυκτεύω, ὥς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων (*οὐκ ἀέρα δέρ.* a concrete
 predicate which Paul attributes to himself, ὥς is qualitative; ὥς *μὴ*
ἂ. δ. would be *as if I would not beat the air*), Gal. iv. 27 (LXX)
εὐφράνθητι στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα etc. *thou that bearest not!* of a
 historic person; see besides 1 Cor. iv. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 8 f.; Acts
 xxvi. 22; xxviii. 17; Heb. xi. 1, (adjectives with *οὐ* Rom. viii. 20;
 Heb. ix. 11); cf. Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 6; Her. 9, 83; Plato, Phaed.
 80 e.; Demosth. Zenothem. p. 576 b.; Strabo 17, 796 and 822;
 Diod. S. 19, 97; Philostr. Apol. 7, 32; Aelian. 10, 11; Lucian.
 Philops. 5; peregr. 34.

In 1 Pet. i. 8 both the negatives are used together: *ὃν οὐκ*
εἰδότες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάσθε
etc.; the *οὐκ εἰδ.* expresses the negative idea (*personally*) *un-*
known as a matter of fact; the *μὴ ὁρ.* means, *although ye see not*,
 referring to the conception of the persons addressed: believing,
 ye rejoice in him, and the thought that ye see him not does not
 restrain you from rejoicing. (In like manner *οὐ* and *μὴ* are con-
 strued with participles in one and the same sentence in Lucian.
 indoct. 5 *καὶ ὁ κυβερνᾶν οὐκ εἰδὼς καὶ ἱππεύειν μὴ μεμελετηκώς*
etc., cf. also Lycurg. 11, 9 and Blume in loc.). In Rom. i. 28 ⁴³¹
 we find *παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ 6th ed.*
καθ' ἡκούτα, but in Eph. v. 3 f. *πορνεία καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία ...*

¹ The difference between *οὐ* and *μὴ* with participles is well illustrated by Plat. Phaed. 63 b. *ἡδίκουν ἂν οὐκ ἀγανακτῶν* *injuste facerem ego, qui non indignor*; on the other hand, *ἡδ. ἂν μὴ ἀγαν.* (according to Olympiod.) *injuste facerem si non indignarer*. Cf. also Joseph. antt. 16, 7, 5 δ δὲ Φερώρας εἰς μέσον ἀπέλιπτο, μηδὲν εὐσχημον εἰς ἀπολογίαν ἔχων ... ἀκούσαι δ' οὐ πιστευόμενος.

μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθαι ἐν ὑμῶν . . . ἡ εὐτραπέλεια, τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα. The latter (in apposition) is to be resolved, *which are unseemly things* (which a Christian is bound to shun), actions which are not seemly (as indeed some Codd. [so too Cod. Sin.] have: ἀ οὐκ ἀνήκεν). Gal. iv. 8 τότε οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε εἰς. is a glance at a past historic fact, and οὐκ εἶδ. form a single idea: *ignorantes deum, ἄθεοι*; on the contrary, 1 Thess. iv. 5 τὰ ἔθνη
 508 τὰ μὴ εἰδὸτα τὸν θεόν, and 2 Thess. i. 8 τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι θεόν, in dependent construction.

Sometimes, however, μή would appear to stand for οὐ, but Rom. iv. 19 καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα etc. means, *he regarded not his body, quippe qui non esset imbecillis*; κατενόησε expresses a fact, but *the being weak in faith* only a supposition, which is to be denied (οὐκ ἀσθενήσας would mean, *strong in faith*). According to another construction, it might, indeed, also have run thus: οὐκ ἠνθόησεν . . . ὥστε
 458 κατανοῆσαι etc., cf. Plut. reg. apophth. p. 81 Tauchn. On the other hand,
 7th ed. Heb. vii. 6 ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αἰτῶν δεδεκάτωκε τὸν Ἀβραάμ is probably to be explained on the principle, that in antitheses (cf. vs. 5), where a peculiarly strong negation is intended (and the negative is accented), the Greeks use μή (by which even the supposition is denied). See above, no. 1 and Hm. Soph. Antig. 691, which will be quoted presently. In Luke i. 20 ἔσθι σωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι the subjective negation is so much the more fitting, as a particular condition is designated as but just announced, and consequently existing but in thought (ἔσθι). So also Acts xiii. 11. The connection of the subjective and objective negatives appears strangest in Acts ix. 9 ἦν ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ πίεν (cf. Epiphan. Opp. II. 368 etc. ἦν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι). But here the not eating and not drinking are related as matters of fact; whereas the βλέπων, which from vs. 8 one might have supposed to be returning, is as a supposition denied antithetically. The remark of Hm. Soph. Antig. 691 is applicable here: μή fortius est, quia ad oppositum refertur: nam οὐκ ἔαν simpliciter est *prohibere*, μὴ ἔαν autem dicitur, quum, quem credas siturum, non sinit. Accordingly οὐ βλέπων there would have meant *blind* outright; μὴ βλέπων affirms *not seeing* of one who had had his sight and might be supposed to have it again. Cf. also Juo. vii. 49 ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος, ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, where the ὄχλος is denied an attribute which it could and should have had; μὴ γινώσκ. conveys a censure, οὐ γινώσκ. would be a simple predicate: *unacquainted with the law*. See besides, Luke xiii. 11; Mark v. 26; Acts ix. 7 (cf. vs. 3).

Although, then, it may be quite true as Schaeef. says, Demosth. III. 495: in scriptis cadentis graecitatis vix credas, quoties participialis constructio (especially that of the Genit. absol.) non οὐ etc., ut oportebat, sed μή etc. adsciscat, cf. also Plut. V. 6; Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 28, and above, p. 473

note 3, yet it is indispensable to scrutinize sharply every passage even from the writers of the *κωμή*, before asserting that *μή* stands for *οὐ* (Fr. Rom. 432 II. 295); in particular, as has been already remarked, it should not be ^{6th ed.} overlooked that often much depends, especially in the construction of negatives with participles, on the mode in which the author conceives of his subject, Hm. Vig. 804, 806; Mtth. 1437, 1441. On the general subject 509 cf. also Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 244; Bähr in *Creuzer*, Melet. III. 20; Schaefer. Eurip. Med. 811 ed. Porson.¹

6. Continued negation is, as is well known, expressed by the ⁴⁵⁴ compound negatives *οὐδέ*, *μηδέ*, and *οὔτε*, *μήτε*.² The difference ^{7th ed.} between the two words has often been discussed in modern philology, but has not yet been developed in all its relations and with complete unanimity; see especially Hm. Eurip. Med. 330 sqq. (also in his *Opusc.* III. 143 sqq.) and ad *Philoctet.* p. 140, then Franke, *comm.* II. 5 sqq.; Wex, *Antig.* II. 156 sqq.; Klotz, *Devar.* II. 706 sqq.³

Undoubtedly *οὐδέ* and *οὔτε* run parallel with the conjunctions *δέ* and *τε*, and must be explained primarily from their meaning; accordingly we may say with Herm. that *οὔτε*, *μήτε* are adjunctive, *οὐδέ*, *μηδέ* disjunctive (*δέ* is properly *but*, and denotes an opposition, Franke II. 5), i.e. the latter add negation to negation, the former divide a single negation into parts (which last of course are mutually exclusive).⁴ For instance, Matt. vii. 6 *μή δώτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κυσί, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας* etc. *give not — and cast not* (two different actions are equally denied, i.e. interdicted); Matt. vi. 26 *οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν* etc. *they sow not, and they reap not, and they gather not.* On the other

¹ On Aelian. 3, 2 *ὃ δὲ μὴ δὲν διαπαρὰ χθελὲς εἶπεν*, 14, 33 *ὅς οὐ δὲν διαπαρὰ χθελὲς εἶπεν*, see Fr. Rom. II. 295. Elsewhere *οὐ* is taken for *μή* with particip. sometimes in Plut., see *Helld.* Plutarch. Tim. p. 457 sq., also in Aelian, see Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 187. In like manner *οὐ* seems to me to stand for *μή* in Basilic. I. 150 *παῖδων οὐχ ὑπόρτων σὶ filii non exstant.* As it stands it means, *since children are not in existence.* (Polyb. 7, 9, 12 *τῶν θεῶν οὐ δότων ἑμὶν καὶ ἡμῖν* which Gayler quotes, p. 591, is merely a conjectural reading of *Cusaubon.*) In Lucian. saltat. 75, on the contrary, the transition from *μήτε* into *οὔτε* is owing to an anacoluthon. Lastly, *οὐ* and *μή* are differently construed with participles in Aelian. anim. 5, 28; see Jacobs *in loc.*

² Where *οὐδέ* does not refer to a preceding negation, it denotes, as is well known, *also not*, or *not even* (Klotz, *Devar.* 707). On the latter meaning see Franke II. 11.

³ Cf. *Hand.* de partic. *τε* dissert. 2 p. 9 sqq.; Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 69 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Lach. p. 65, also Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1812. no. 194 S. 516 and Hartung, Partik. I. 191 ff.

⁴ Benfey in the new Jahrb. f. Philol. XII. 155: "As *τε* . . . *τε* connects only ideas or propositions which are mutually complementary and combine into one whole, so *οὔτε* . . . *οὔτε* can connect only such. This higher unity or complex whole is divided by the negated complementary parts; in these neither the negation of the one nor of the other is a whole, but each must be supplemented."

above canon, or appear to do so; since, indeed, generally in the N. T. *if not* is expressed more frequently by *εἰ οὐ* than by *εἰ μή*, which latter phrase most commonly signifies *except*.¹ We divide 500 these passages into four classes:

a) Such as have nothing to do with the question: Luke xii. 26 *εἰ οὐδὲ ἐλάχιστον δύνασθῇ, τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε*; for *εἰ* here is conditional only in appearance; in reality it is equivalent to *ἐπεὶ*, Krü. 271. Translate *if* (as is clear from the alleged cases), i.e. *since you cannot do even the least* etc. (hence always *θαυμάζω εἰ οὐ* cf. Kühner II. 406). So also Rom. xi. 21; Jno. iii. 12; v. 47; x. 35; Heb. xii. 25; 2 Pet. ii. 4; cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 596 *εἰ θέλοντάς γ' οὐδὲ σοὶ φεύγειν καλὸν σι, quum te volunt recipere, ne tibi quidem decorum est exsulem esse*, and Aeschin. ep. 8 *εἰ δὲ οὐδὲ σὺν ἐκείνῳ διέγνωκας ἐξίεναι* etc., Sext. Empir. Math. 7, 434 *εἰ οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἥδει* etc. Xenoph. A. 7, 1, 29; Aesop. 23, 2, see Bhdy. 386; Franke, Demosth. p. 202; Gayl. 118; Hm. Aeschyl. II. 148.

b) Such as, when viewed more closely, are in unison with the above canon: not only 1 Cor. xi. 6 *εἰ γὰρ οὐ κατακαλύπτεται γυνή, καὶ κειράσθω* *if a woman is unveiled, she ought also to be shorn*, 2 Thess. iii. 10, but also Jno. x. 37 *εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς μου, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι· εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε* *if I omit the works of my Father (and thus withhold from you the proofs of my divine mission) etc.; but if I do them etc.*, Jno. iii. 12; Rom. viii. 9; Rev. xx. 15; cf. Lys. accus. Agor. 446 76 *ἐὰν μὲν οὖν φάσκη Φρύνιχον ἀποκτείνειν, τούτων μέμνησθε . . . ἐὰν δ' οὐ φάσκη, ἔρεσθε αὐτόν* etc. *but if he denies it*, Sext. Empir. Math. 2, 111 *εἰ μὲν λήμματά τινα ἔχει . . . εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει* etc. *but if he is destitute of them*, 9, 176 *εἰ μὲν οὐκ ἔχει, φαῦλόν ἐστι τὸ θεῖον . . . εἰ δὲ ἔχει, ἔσται τι τοῦ θεοῦ κρείττον*, hypotyp. 2, 5. 160. 175; Lucian. paras. 12; Galen. temper. 1, 3; Mr. Anton. 11, 18 p. 193 Mor. (cf. also Euseb. de die dom. p. 9 Jani). Nor is there anything to object against 1 Cor. xv. 13: *εἰ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστι* *if the resurrection of the dead is a chimera*, etc.; cf. in the preceding context *πῶς λέγουσί τινες ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν*; On vs. 16 cf. Philostr. Apoll. 4, 16, p. 154.

c) Cases in which the proposition with *εἰ οὐ* merely negatives 425 the idea which is expressed affirmatively in a corresponding proposition, without the *οὐ* coalescing with the negated word into a 6th ed.

¹ *εἰ οὐ* and *εἰ μή* are well distinguished in a single sentence in Acta Thom. p. 57 ed. Thilo.

single opposed idea: 1 Cor. ix. 2 εἰ ἄλλοις οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλάγε ὑμῖν εἰμὶ, si aliis non sum apostolus, vobis certe sum. Luke xi. 8, cf. xviii. 4. But even in such oppositions later writers use εἰ οὐ, e.g. Sext. Empir. Math. 11, 5 εἰ μὲν ἀγαθὸν ἐστίν, ἐν τῶν τριῶν γενήσεται, εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐστίν ἀγαθόν, ἤτοι κακόν ἐστίν, ἢ οὔτε κακόν ἐστίν οὔτε ἀγαθόν ἐστίν, Diog. L. 2, 36 εἰ μὲν γάρ τι τῶν προσόντων λέξειαν, διορθώσονται, εἰ δ' οὐ, οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, where the sense is 501 not: if, however, they *be silent* about it, but, if they do *not* say something useful,¹ cf. Judg. ix. 20; Judith v. 21; Demosth. epp. p. 125 a.; Basilic. II. 525, and Poppo Xen. Anab. p. 358.

d) Cases in which οὐ likewise antithetically denies, without, however, an express affirmative proposition preceding: Jas. ii. 11 εἰ οὐ μοιχεύσεις (with reference to the preceding μὴ μοιχεύσης), φονεύσεις δέ, γέγονας παραβάτης νόμου *if thou dost not commit adultery, yet if thou killest*,² i. 23; iii. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 22 εἰ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα (where the rendering, *if any one hateth the Lord*, would probably not represent the apostle's meaning); 2 Jno. 10 εἰ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει, Luke xiv. 26.

For the later prose writers, then, who in general use εἰ οὐ (as the stronger and more expressive form) much oftener than the older writers (who were rather frugal in its use), we may state the rule thus (cf. also Anton, Progr. de discrim. particul. οὐ et μὴ, Gorlic. 1823, 4to. p. 9): where *not* in a conditional proposition is emphatic,³ εἰ οὐ (as in Latin *si non*) is used; but where *if not* stands without emphasis on the negation, εἰ μὴ (as in Latin *nisi*): 447 e.g. if thou dost *not* commit adultery (with reference to the pre-^{7th ed}ceding μὴ μοιχ.), if any man loveth *not* the Lord (as he ought), if I am *not* an apostle unto others, Jno. i. 25 if thou art *not* the Christ, cf. vs. 20. The emphasis is brought out by an antithesis, either open (1 Cor. ix. 2)⁴ or concealed (1 Cor. xvi. 22). It lies, however, in the nature of the case that οὐ then negatives only a *part* of the conditional proposition, not the proposition itself.

¹ Macar. homil. 1, 10. Cf. also ἐάν Diog. L. 1, 105 ἐάν νέος ἦν τὸν οἶνον οὐ φέρῃς, γέρων γενόμενος ὕδωρ οἶσιν.

² Equivalent to εἰ οὐ μοιχεύων ἔσθ, φονεύων δέ, cf. Arrian. Epict. 1, 29, 35; 2, 11, 22. On the contrary, Thuc. 1, 32 εἰ μὴ μετὰ κακίας, δόξης δὲ μᾶλλον ἁμαρτία . . . ἐναντία πολέμῳ.

³ Mehlhorn, as above, gives the rule: ubi simpliciter negatio affirmationi ita opponatur, ut negandi part. voce sit acuenda, semper οὐ poni, ubi contra verbum voce inprimis, notandum μὴ esse debere. Cf. also Poppo on Xen. Anab. as above.

⁴ Cf. also e.g. Aesop. 7, 4 εἰ οὐ σοὶ τοῦτο προσέφερον, οὐκ ἂν ἡμῖν αὐτὸ συνεβούλευες *if it were not useful to thee, thou wouldst not advise us to it*.

ὥστε (Krü. p. 272 f.) of a consequence even when represented as mere matter of fact is used in the N. T. always with μή and the Infinitive, Matt. viii. 28; Mark i. 45; ii. 2; iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Thess. i. 8. Only in 2 Cor. iii. 7 is there a logical ground for it in the conditional proposition; Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 219.

426 After ὅτι and ἐπεὶ because (in direct discourse) οὐ follows regularly, Jno. 8th ed. viii. 20, 37; Rom. xi. 6; Luke i. 34; Bäumlein S. 773; ὅτι μή in conditional discourse occurs in Jno. iii. 18. On the contrary, we have in Heb. 502 ix. 17, in direct discourse, διαθήκη ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει, ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθίμενος, which Böhme explains thus: μήποτε seems here to negative even the idea of ἰσχύει; consequently in general to deny more strongly than οὐποτε. Yet Böhme's rendering of μήποτε by *nondum* is erroneous; it means, *never, never at all* (Heliod. 2, 19). And perhaps the author gave the preference to μήποτε on this account also, because he is speaking in general terms and not of any particular testament. However, in later authors the subjective negation frequently occurs in connection with ἐπεὶ (ὅτι) *quandoquidem*, not only where something is clearly designated as a subjective reason (as is perceptible even in Aelian. 12, 63; cf. besides, Philostr. Apoll. 7, 16; Lucian. Hermot. 47), but also where an objectively valid reason is assigned (Gayl. 183 sqq.; Mdv. p. 245; on Lucian and Arrian in particular, Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. praefat. p. 23 sqq., cf. also Ptol. geogr. 8, 1, 3), in so far as the reason falls back at last on a supposition. Others (Bengel, Lchm.) take μήποτε in Heb., as above, as an interrogative, as indeed ἐπεὶ often introduces a question, Rom. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; xv. 29; Klotz, Devar. p. 543. This seems to me, however, to be too rhetorical for the style.

3. e. In relative clauses with ἄν (ἐάν), Luke viii. 18 ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, Acts iii. 23 (Sept.) πάντα ψυχῇ, ἥτις ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ, Rev. xiii. 15 ὅσοι ἂν μὴ προσκυνήσωσιν, Luke ix. 5. In all these cases nothing is denied as a matter of fact of particular subjects, but the language is only conditional and supposed: whoever hath not (may not have). Relative clauses without ἄν have regularly οὐ, Jno. iv. 22 προσκυνεῖτε δ' οὐκ οἴδατε, Luke xiv. 27 ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει, Rom. x. 14; 1 Cor. v. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 10; 1 Jno. iv. 6, etc., so far forth as they deny something as matter of fact; on the other hand, 448 μὴ occurs sometimes in such cases when the negation refers only 7th ed. to a supposition (assumption, condition) (Hm. Vig. 805; Krü. 271), 2 Pet. i. 9 ὃ μὴ πάρεστι ταῦτα, τυφλὸς ἐστὶν *whoso lacketh, if any man lack*, etc. In 1 Tim. v. 13; Tit. i. 11 τὰ μὴ δέοντα and ἃ μὴ δεῖ (cf. Rom. i. 28; Soph. Phil. 583) express merely a moral conception: *quae, si quae non sunt honesta*; whereas ἃ οὐ δεῖ would denote positively *inhonesta*, the kind of unseemly things objectively present, cf. Gayl. 240 f. In Col. ii. 18 μὴ before

ἐώρακεν¹ is expunged by the more recent critics; only Tisch. in the 2d [and 7th] Leipzig ed. restores it, and undoubtedly it has 503 the greatest amount of external authority on its side (Mey. states the authorities imperfectly). If the negation [which is wanting, moreover, in Cod. Sin.*] be genuine (some authorities have οὐ), μή must be used because even the relative clause is viewed by 427 Paul subjectively, as μηδεὶς ὑμ. καταβραβεύετω.² 6th ed.

Frequently ὅς is followed by οὐ, where, since apparently a mere supposition is uttered, some have expected μή (Lipsius de modis p. 14), as in Matt. xxiv. 2 οὐ μή ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, ὅς οὐ καταλυθήσεται (but here μή is not indispensable, inasmuch as the words deny a matter of fact); and also where in Latin the Subjunctive would stand, and therefore μή would have been expected, Matt. x. 26 οὐδὲν ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, Luke viii. 17; xii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 2; cf. 1 Kings viii. 46. For instances from Greek authors (Hm. Vig. p. 709) see Eur. Hel. 509 sq. ἀνὴρ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε . . . ὅς . . . οὐ δώσει βοράν, Lucian. sacrif. 1 οὐκ οἶδα, εἰ τις οὕτω κατηφής ἐστι, ὅστις οὐ γελίσκεται, Soph. Oed. R. 374 οὐδεὶς ὅς οὐχὶ τῶνδ' ὀνειδιεῖ τάχα. In all these cases the relative clause is considered as a definite, objective predicate, as if it were said ἀνὴρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε οὐ δώσει βοράν; even in construction with the Optative, Isocr. Evagor. p. 452 οὐκ ἐστίν, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν Αἰακίδος προκρίνειεν, also p. 199; Plut. apophth. p. 196 c. Closely allied to this is the phrase τίς ἐστω, ὅς οὐ followed by the Pres. indic. Acts xix. 35; Heb. xii. 7; cf. Dion. comp. 11 ed. Schaef. p. 120, which in sense is equivalent to οὐδεὶς ἐστω, ὅς οὐ (for which Strabo 6, 286 has οὐδὲν μέρος αὐτῆς ἐστω, ὃ μὴ . . . τυγχάνει); on the other hand, οὐδεὶς ἐστω, ὅς οὐ with the Preterite, is beyond the range of those cases in which one would expect μή, Xen. An. 4, 5, 31; Thuc. 3, 81; Lucian. Tox. 22; asin. 49; cf. Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 233; Weber, Demosth. 356 sq. See also Gayl. p. 257 sqq., who, it must be confessed, has not discriminated sufficiently.

4. f. With Infinitives (Mth. 1442; Krü. 273), not only such as depend on a verb of *thinking, speaking, commanding, wishing* (of 449 course also in the construction of the Accusative with the Infinitive) Matt. ii. 12; v. 34, 39; Luke ii. 26; v. 14; xx. 7; xxi. 14; Acts iv. 17 f. 20; v. 28; x. 28; xv. 19, 38; xix. 31; xxi. 4; xxiii. 8; xxvii. 21; Rom. ii. 21 f; xii. 3; xiii. 3; 1 Cor. v. 9, 11;

¹ Cf. Philostr. Apoll. 7, 27 διελέγετο ἃ μὴ ἐκείνῃ προύβαινε quae illi haud prodessent. From the Sept. may be adduced Exod. ix. 21 ὅς μὴ προσέσχε τῇ διανοίᾳ εἰς τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου in opposition to ὃ φοβούμενος τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου vs. 20; thus just like εἰ δὲ μή in antithesis. Οὐ and μή after relat. in parallel propositions, see Arrian. Epict. 2, 2, 4.

² In propositions with particles of time (Gayler, p. 185 sqq.) μή does not happen to occur in the N. T.; several times οὐ is quite regularly joined to the Indicative of time, Jno. ix. 4; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Acts xxii. 11.

2 Cor. ii. 1; x. 2; Heb. ix. 8, etc., or by which a design is expressed 2 Cor. iv. 4 ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα . . . εἰς τὸ μὴ αἰγάζαι, 1 Thess. ii. 9 ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι, Acts xx. 27 οὐχ
 504 ὑπεστειλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι, 1 Pet. iv. 2, — but also where the Infinitive is the subject of a proposition, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρεῖττον ἢ αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι, Luke xvii. 1, or, being joined to a preposition, is resolvable into a finite verb with οὐ, Jas. iv. 2 οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς (ὅτι οὐκ αἰτεῖσθε ἑμείς), Luke viii. 6; Acts xxviii. 18; Heb. x. 2. But in that first case ἐπεγνωκ. is denied only as a supposition (in fact they had known), and in the second the cause is represented not objectively, but as primarily the thought of the speaker. Precedents from the classics for all
 428 this, see in Gayler 294 sqq.; cf. Rost 750; Bäumlein nr. 99, S.
 428 f. Also those parts of speech which belong essentially to the Infinitive clause are negated by μή, e.g. 2 Cor. x. 2.

The cases in the Infinitive construction in which οὐ is, and can or must be, used have been pointed out by Rost 747 f.; Krü. 274; Bäumlein S. 778. In Jno. xxi. 25 ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἑν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφ. βιβλία the negation belongs to οἶμαι, cf. Xen. M. 2, 2, 10 ἐγὼ μὲν οἶμαι, εἰ τοιαύτην μὴ δύνασθαι φέρειν μητέρα, ἀγαθὰ σε οὐ δύνασθαι φέρειν. In Heb. vii. 11 τίς ἔτι χρεῖα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδ. ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν λέγεσθαι the negation does not belong to the Infinitive, but negatives the words κατὰ τ. τάξ. Ἀαρ. Οὐ is often in dependent clauses joined thus to a single word, Krü. S. 270.

• When after a verb of *understanding* or *saying*, in direct discourse etc., the assertion, observation etc. is expressed in a clause with *ὅτι*, the negation is made by οὐ, Luke xiv. 24 λέγω ὑμῖν, *ὅτι* οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν . . . γένηται τοῦ δείπνου, xviii. 29; Jno. v. 42 ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς *ὅτι* τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε etc., viii. 55; Acts ii. 81 etc. The proposition with *ὅτι* stands here as a pure objective proposition just as in indirect question (§ 41, 4), as if it were οὐδεὶς . . . γένηται, τοῦτο ὑμῖν λέγω, while the Infinitive construction brings it into immediate connection with, and consequently dependence on, λέγω, ὁρῶ etc. Cf. Krü. 253, 270; Mdv. 235.

5. g. With Participles (Gayl. 274 sqq.; Krü. 274 f.) μή is used not only when they belong to a proposition which, as expressing command, design, condition, etc., requires the subjective negation (see no. 2), Eph. v. 27; Phil. i. 28; ii. 4; iii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. vi. 1; Jas. i. 5; Tit. ii. 9 f.; Rom. viii. 4; xiv. 3; Matt. xxii. 24; Acts xv. 38; Luke iii. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 21; cf. Soph. Oed.

C. 1155, 980; Plato, rep. 2, 370 e.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 26; Krü. 273, 450
— but also under other circumstances: 7th ed.

a. when they refer, not to particular persons, but to a supposed 505
genus: Matt. xii. 30 ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν *he who is*
not with me i.e. whoever belongs to this class of men that I have
in mind, *si quis non stet a meis partibus*, Hm. Vig. 805; Mtth.
1441 sq.; Krü. 174 (ὁ οὐκ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ would mean a particular
individual who actually was not with him), Matt. xxv. 29; Luke vi.
49; Jno. x. 1; xii. 48; xx. 24 [?]; Rom. iv. 5; xiv. 22; Jas. ii. 13;
iv. 17; 1 Jno. ii. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 37; hence with πᾶς Matt. xiii. 19;
Jno. xv. 2. Also 2 Jno. 7 πολλοὶ πλάνοι εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον οἱ
μὴ ὁμολογούντες Ἰησοῦν Χρ. etc. belongs here; the words do not
mean many deceivers — namely, those who do not confess (οἱ οὐχ
ὁμολ.) — but, many deceivers, all those who do not confess, quicun-
que non profitentur.

β. when they apply to particular persons indeed, but ascribe to
them a quality only conditionally or in thought: Luke xi. 24
ὅταν ... ἐξέλθῃ ... διέρχεται δι' ἀνδρῶν τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπανσιν,
καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον λέγει *if he finds it not, in case he does not* etc., Rom.
ii. 14; Gal. vi. 9 θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι, Luke xii. 47 ἐκεῖνος ὁ
δοῦλος (vs. 45 f.) ὁ μὴ ἐτοιμάσας μηδὲ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα δαρή- 429
σεται (this is propounded as one of two possible cases); 1 Cor. 6th ed.
x. 33 πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω, μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαντοῦ συμφέρον *I seek to*
please all, (supposition) *as one who, inasmuch as I* etc., ix. 21;
2 Cor. vi. 3; Rom. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iii. 1, 5 (against Rückert see
Lünemann in loc.); Jno. vii. 15 πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδε μὴ
μεμαθηκώς; since he can't have learned (since we, surely, know
him to be such a one as has never learned? cf. Philostr. Apoll.
3, 22 ὃς καὶ γράφει μὴ μαθὼν γράμματα). Luke vii. 33 ἐλήλυθεν
Ἰωάννης μῆτε ἐσθίων ἄρτον μῆτε πίνων οἶνον *without having eaten ...*
drunken (spoken from the position of those who, observing this,
are introduced as saying so); οὔτε ἐσθίων οὔτε πίνων would express
the predicates as pure matters of fact. In Luke iv. 35 τὸ δαιμόνιον
ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάβαν αὐτόν, by the last words the author
does not mean to relate a mere matter of fact (οὐδὲν βλάβ. αὐτόν
and did not harm him), but to exclude merely the thought that
the evil spirit had in any way injured the possessed: *he had not*
(as one might perhaps have thought) *injured him*.

Thus μὴ is very often to be understood: Acts v. 7; xx. 22;
Heb. iv. 15; xi. 8; Matt. xxii. 12. Cf. what Klotz says, Devar.
p. 666: quibus in locis omnibus propterea μὴ positum est, non οὐ,

quod ille, qui loquitur, non rem ipsam spectat sed potius cogitationem rei, quam vult ex animo audientis amovere (Plut. Pompej. 506 c. 64); Hm. Vig. 806. In Matt. xviii. 25 *μὴ ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ πραθῆναι* etc. the first words express a *fact*, indeed, *as he had not*; but in this construction they are put in close relation with ἐκέλ.: *he commanded, because that* 451 *man had not*, because he knew that the man had not, etc. So also Acts xxi. 34; Luke ii. 45; xxiv. 23; Acts ix. 26; xiii. 28; xvii. 6; xxvii. 7, 20; 1 Pet. iv. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9; cf. Plut. Pompej. c. 23 and Alex. 51; Polyb. 17, 7, 5; 5, 30, 5. On Rom. ix. 11 see Fr. Acts xx. 29 οἶδα ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται . . . λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου is, as the Future shows, to be taken altogether as an ideal picture. Also Heb. ix. 9 *μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνειδησιν τελειῶσαι* etc. is spoken in the view of the writer; had it been οὐ δυνάμ. an actual inherent property would have been signified (*not being able*), but such offerings Israelites would not have presented. 1 Cor. i. 28 ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ, where τὰ οὐκ ὄντα would signify (Hm. Vig. 889) *the non-existing* (as a *single* negative idea), but τὰ μὴ ὄντα must mean *which were reckoned as things that did not exist*; the ὄντα is negated as a supposition, not spoken actually of *nonentities*.¹ In 2 Cor. iv. 18 (even in the second proposition, which is categorical) to τὰ βλεπόμενα stands opposed τὰ μὴ βλεπ., not τὰ οὐ βλεπ. (Heb. xi. 1). This last would denote what actually is not seen 430 (τὰ ἀόρατα), but τὰ μὴ βλεπ. expresses, in conjunction with μὴ 6th ed. σκοποῦντων ἡμῶν, the *subjective* view of the believer, cf. Heb. xi. 7. Also in 2 Cor. v. 21 τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε, the μὴ. γν. carries us back to the conception of him who makes him ἁμαρτία; τὸν οὐ γνόντα would be objective and equivalent to τὸν ἀγνοοῦντα,² Isae. 1, 11 and Schoem. in loc. 2 Cor. vi. 3 does not read οὐδεμίαν ἐν οὐδενὶ διδόντες προσκοπήν, because this would exhibit merely an actually existing characteristic, but μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ διδ. πρ. because the characteristic is regarded, in connection with παρακαλοῦμεν vs. 1, as subjectively adhered to and continually striven after. Cf. besides, Luke vii. 30; Jno. vii. 49; 1 Cor. ix. 20 f. So with ὥς in subjective speech, 1 Cor. iv. 7 τί κενχᾶσαι ὥς μὴ λαβών; iv. 18; vii. 29; 2 Cor. x. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 16; Gayler 278 sq. (otherwise 1 Cor. ix. 26, see below).

¹ Μὴ ὄντα and οὐκ ὄντα are united in Xen. An. 4, 4, 15.

² The remark of Rückert on this passage, that in Greek οὐ never stands between the article and participle but always μὴ, is wholly empirical, and false besides, and has been properly refuted by Mey.

On the other hand, *οὐ* with participles (and adjectives) — with which it occurs far less frequently — negatives actually and without qualification (Gayl. 287 sq.; Mtth. 1442), and hence stands especially with predicates which are denied of definite persons:¹ Phil. iii. 3 *ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι θεῷ λατρεύοντες . . .* 452 *καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιοῦτες* (the *ἡμεῖς*, since they actually are ^{7th ed.} πνεύμ. θεῷ λατρ., are denied to be *ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιοῦτες*); 1 Pet. 507 ii. 10 *ὑμεῖς . . . οἱ οὐκ ἐλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες*, Rom. ix. 25 (LXX.); Heb. xi. 35 *ἔλαβον γυναῖκες . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν* (*not accepting*, i.e. disdaining); Col. ii. 19 *εἰκὴ φυσιοῦμενος . . . καὶ οὐ κρατῶν*, although the sentence is imperative (vs. 18 *μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω* and *ἂ μὴ ἐώρακεν* etc.), yet with *οὐ κρατ.* the apostle passes over to a predicate actually existing, Acts xvii. 27; Luke vi. 42; 1 Cor. ix. 26 *ἐγὼ οὕτω πικτεύω, ὥς οὐκ ἄέρα δέρων* (*οὐκ ἄέρα δέρ.* a concrete predicate which Paul attributes to himself, *ὥς* is qualitative; *ὥς μὴ ἂ. δ.* would be *as if I would not beat the air*), Gal. iv. 27 (LXX) *εὐφράνθητι στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα* etc. *thou that bearest not!* of a historic person; see besides 1 Cor. iv. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 8 f.; Acts xxvi. 22; xxviii. 17; Heb. xi. 1, (adjectives with *οὐ* Rom. viii. 20; Heb. ix. 11); cf. Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 6; Her. 9, 83; Plato, Phaed. 80 e.; Demosth. Zenothem. p. 576 b.; Strabo 17, 796 and 822; Diod. S. 19, 97; Philostr. Apol. 7, 32; Aelian. 10, 11; Lucian. Philops. 5; peregr. 34.

In 1 Pet. i. 8 both the negatives are used together: *ὃν οὐκ εἰδότες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε* etc.; the *οὐκ εἰδ.* expresses the negative idea (*personally*) *unknown* as a matter of fact; the *μὴ ὁρ.* means, *although ye see not*, referring to the conception of the persons addressed: believing, ye rejoice in him, and the thought that ye see him not does not restrain you from rejoicing. (In like manner *οὐ* and *μὴ* are construed with participles in one and the same sentence in Lucian. indoct. 5 *καὶ ὁ κυβερνᾷν οὐκ εἰδὼς καὶ ἱππεύειν μὴ μεμελετηκώς* etc., cf. also Lycurg. 11, 9 and Blume in loc.). In Rom. i. 28 431 ^{6th ed.} we find *παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα*, but in Eph. v. 3 f. *πορνεία καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία . . .*

¹ The difference between *οὐ* and *μὴ* with participles is well illustrated by Plat. Phaed. 63 b. *ἡδίκουν ἂν οὐκ ἀγανακτῶν* *injuste facerem ego, qui non indignor*; on the other hand, *ἡδ. ἂν μὴ ἀγαν.* (according to Olympiod.) *injuste facerem si non indignarer*. Cf. also Joseph. antt. 16, 7, 5 *ὁ δὲ Φερώρας εἰς μέσον ἀπειλήπτο, μηδὲν εὐσχημον εἰς ἀπολογίαν ἔχων . . . ἀκούσαι δ' οὐ πιστευόμενος*.

μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν . . . ἢ εὐτραπέλλια, τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα. The latter (in apposition) is to be resolved, *which are unseemly things* (which a Christian is bound to shun), actions which are not seemly (as indeed some Codd. [so too Cod. Sin.] have: ἀ οὐκ ἀνήκειν). Gal. iv. 8 τότε οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε etc. is a glance at a past historic fact, and οὐκ εἶδ. form a *single* idea: *ignorantes deum, ἄθεοι*; on the contrary, 1 Thess. iv. 5 τὰ ἔθνη
 508 τὰ μὴ εἰδὸτα τὸν θεόν, and 2 Thess. i. 8 τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι θεόν, in dependent construction.

Sometimes, however, μή would appear to stand for οὐ, but Rom. iv. 19 καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα etc. means, *he regarded not his body, quippe qui non esset imbecillis*; κατενόησε expresses a fact, but *the being weak in faith* only a supposition, which is to be denied (οὐκ ἀσθενήσας would mean, *strong in faith*). According to another construction, it might, indeed, also have run thus: οὐκ ἡσθόνῃσαν . . . ὥστε
 453 κατανοῆσαι etc., cf. Plut. reg. apophth. p. 81 Tauchn. On the other hand,
 7th ed Heb. vii. 6 ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν δεδεκάτωκε τὸν Ἀβραάμ is probably to be explained on the principle, that in antitheses (cf. vs. 5), where a peculiarly strong negation is intended (and the negative is accented), the Greeks use μή (by which even the supposition is denied). See above, no. 1 and Hm. Soph. Antig. 691, which will be quoted presently. In Luke i. 20 ἔση σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι the subjective negation is so much the more fitting, as a particular condition is designated as but just announced, and consequently existing but in thought (ἔση). So also Acts xiii. 11. The connection of the subjective and objective negatives appears strangest in Acts ix. 9 ἦν ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν (cf. Epiphan. Opp. II. 368 etc. ἦν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι). But here the not eating and not drinking are related as matters of fact; whereas the βλέπων, which from vs. 8 one might have supposed to be returning, is as a supposition denied antithetically. The remark of Hm. Soph. Antig. 691 is applicable here: μή fortius est, quia ad oppositum refertur: nam οὐκ ἔαν simpliciter est *prohibere*, μὴ ἔαν autem dicitur, quum, quem credas siturum, non sinit. Accordingly οὐ βλέπων there would have meant *blind* outright; μὴ βλέπων affirms *not seeing* of one who had had his sight and might be supposed to have it again. Cf. also Juo. vii. 49 ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος, ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, where the ὄχλος is denied an attribute which it could and should have had; μὴ γινώσκ. conveys a censure, οὐ γινώσκ. would be a simple predicate: unacquainted with the law. See besides, Luke xiii. 11; Mark v. 26; Acts ix. 7 (cf. vs. 3).

Although, then, it may be quite true as Schaefer says, Demosth. III. 495: in scriptis cadentis graecitatis vix credas, quoties participialis constructio (especially that of the Genit. absol.) non οὐ etc., ut oportebat, sed μή etc. adsciscat, cf. also Plut. V. 6; Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 28, and above, p. 473

note 3, yet it is indispensable to scrutinize sharply every passage even from the writers of the *κωμή*, before asserting that *μή* stands for *οὐ* (Fr. Rom. 432 II. 295); in particular, as has been already remarked, it should not be overlooked that often much depends, especially in the construction of negatives with participles, on the mode in which the author conceives of his subject, Hm. Vig. 804, 806; Mtth. 1437, 1441. On the general subject 509 cf. also Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 244; Bähr in Creuzer, Melet. III. 20; Schaef. Eurip. Med. 811 ed. Porson.¹

6. Continued negation is, as is well known, expressed by the compound negatives *οὐδέ*, *μηδέ*, and *οὔτε*, *μήτε*.² The difference between the two words has often been discussed in modern philology, but has not yet been developed in all its relations and with complete unanimity; see especially Hm. Eurip. Med. 330 sqq. (also in his Opusc. III. 143 sqq.) and ad Philoctet. p. 140, then Franke, comm. II. 5 sqq.; Wex, Antig. II. 156 sqq.; Klotz, Devar. II. 706 sqq.³

Undoubtedly *οὐδέ* and *οὔτε* run parallel with the conjunctions *δέ* and *τε*, and must be explained primarily from their meaning; accordingly we may say with Herm. that *οὔτε*, *μήτε* are adjunctive, *οὐδέ*, *μηδέ* disjunctive (*δέ* is properly *but*, and denotes an opposition, Franke II. 5), i.e. the latter add negation to negation, the former divide a single negation into parts (which last of course are mutually exclusive).⁴ For instance, Matt. vii. 6 *μή δώτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κυσί, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας* etc. *give not — and cast not* (two different actions are equally denied, i.e. interdicted); Matt. vi. 26 *οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν* etc. *they sow not, and they reap not, and they gather not*. On the other

¹ On Aelian. 3, 2 *ὅ δὲ μηδὲν διαταραχθεὶς εἶπεν*, 14, 38 *ὅς οὐδὲν διαταραχθεὶς εἶπεν*, see Fr. Rom. II. 295. Elsewhere *οὐ* is taken for *μή* with particip. sometimes in Plut., see *Held*, Plutarch. Tim. p. 457 sq., also in Aelian, see Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 187. In like manner *οὐ* seems to me to stand for *μή* in Basilic. I. 150 *παίδων οὐχ ὑπόντων σὶ filii non exstant*. As it stands it means, *since children are not in existence*. (Polyb. 7, 9, 12 *τῶν θεῶν οὐ δόντων θμῖν καὶ ἡμῖν* which Gayler quotes, p. 591, is merely a conjectural reading of *Cassiodorus*.) In Lucian. saltat. 75, on the contrary, the transition from *μήτε* into *οὔτε* is owing to an anacoluthon. Lastly, *οὐ* and *μή* are differently construed with participles in Aelian. anim. 5, 28; see Jacobs in loc.

² Where *οὐδέ* does not refer to a preceding negation, it denotes, as is well known, *also not*, or *not even* (Klotz, Devar. 707). On the latter meaning see Franke II. 11.

³ Cf. *Hand*, de partic. *τε* dissert. 2 p. 9 sqq.; Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 69 sq.; Stallh. Plat. Lach. p. 65, also Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1812. no. 194 S. 516 and Hartung, Partik. I. 191 ff.

⁴ Benfey in the new Jahrb. f. Philol. XII. 155: "As *τε* . . . *τε* connects only ideas or propositions which are mutually complementary and combine into one whole, so *οὔτε* . . . *οὔτε* can connect only such. This higher unity or complex whole is divided by the negated complementary parts; in these neither the negation of the one nor of the other is a whole, but each must be supplemented."

hand, Matt. xii. 32 οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι forgiveness will not be imparted, *neither* in this 433 world, *nor* in that which is to come (the single negation οὐκ ἀφεθ. 64 ed. is distributed into two parts on the basis of time); Luke ix. 3 510 μηδὲν αἵρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν μήτε ῥάβδον μήτε πῆραν μήτε ἄρτον· μήτε ὑργύριον.

In this acceptation, then, the following particles are usually correlative:

a. Οὐ . . . οὐδέ Matt. vi. 28; vii. 18; Luke vi. 44; Jno. xiii. 16; xiv. 17; Acts ix. 9; Rom. ii. 28, μή . . . μηδέ Matt. vi. 25; x. 14; xxiii. 9 f.; Mark xiii. 15; Luke xvii. 23; Jno. iv. 15; Acts iv. 18; Rom. vi. 12 f.; 2 Cor. iv. 2; 1 Tim. i. 3 f., οὐ . . . οὐδέ . . . οὐδέ Matt. xii. 19; Jno. i. 13, 25,¹ μή . . . μηδέ . . . μηδέ Rom. xiv. 21; Col. ii. 21; Luke xiv. 12 (*not* . . . *nor* . . . *nor*);

b. Οὐ . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε Matt. xii. 32, μή . . . μήτε . . . μήτε 1 Tim. i. 7, μή . . . μήτε . . . μήτε . . . μήτε Jas. v. 12 (μήτε three times), Matt. v. 34 ff. (μήτε four times) *not* . . . *neither* . . . *nor* etc.; but 455 still more frequently without a simple negation preceding, Jno. 74 ed. v. 37 οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκηκόατε πώποτε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἐωράκατε, Matt. vi. 20; xxii. 30; Luke xiv. 35; Jno. viii. 19; ix. 3; Acts xv. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 5 f.; Rom. viii. 38 (ten times), Matt. xi. 18 ἦλθε Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων, Acts xxvii. 20; Heb. vii. 3² *neither* . . . *nor* etc. Accordingly, οὔτε and μήτε regularly refer to another οὔτε and μήτε (or τε or καί)³ — just as τε . . . τε (τε . . . καί) correspond to each other; but οὐδέ and μηδέ connect themselves with a preceding οὐ or μή, as in fact δέ always refers to something that precedes. Hence it may be laid down as a principle (resulting from the respective import of τε and δέ), that οὔτε . . . οὔτε denote a more intimate connection than οὐ . . . οὐδέ. Klotz, Devar. 707 sq.⁴ In this correlation, however, it is a

¹ In Judges i. 27 we find οὐ followed by οὐδέ fourteen times.

² 1 Cor. vi. 10 οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὐ etc. is remarkable only for the accumulation of negatives. For that there is nothing singular in οὐ coming after οὔτε, even though it be not supported by the passage quoted by Gayl. 386 from Soph. Antig. 4 f., cf. (Dio C. 205, 6; 412, 59) Klotz l. c. 711. See also no. 9 below, p. 500.

³ As to a single μήτε with the suppression of the other, see *Hm. Soph. Philoct.* p. 139 sq. and in general, *Frankes II.* 13 sq.

⁴ Cum οὔτε et ad priora respicere possit et ad sequentia, aptior connexio est singulorum membrorum per eas particulas, multo autem dissolutior et fortuita magis conjunctio membrorum per οὐδέ . . . οὐδέ particulas, quia prius οὐδέ nunquam respicit ad ea quae sequuntur sed ad priora . . . alterum autem οὐδέ per aliquam oppositionis rationem, quam habet δέ particula, sequentia adjungit prioribus, non apte connexa, sed potius fortuito concursu accedentia. On this account, however, δέ is still stronger than τε. *Frankes II.* 6, 15.

matter of indifference whether the things denied are individual words (conceptions) merely, or entire sentences; and entire sentences are with as much propriety rendered negative by *οὔτε* . . . *οὔτε* Acts xxviii. 21 (Plato, rep. 10, 597 c.; Phaedr. 260 c.), as individual words are by *οὐ* . . . *οὐδέ*.¹ In the latter case, it is true, the verb serves for all the negative members. Matt. x. 9 *μὴ* 511 *κτῆσθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκόν*, 2 Pet. i. 8 *οὐκ ἀργούς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν* etc., Matt. xxii. 29; xxiv. 20; xxv. 13; 1 Jno. iii. 18. In Matt. x. 9 the other form of negation might have been employed, if the evangelist had said *μηδὲν κτήσ. μήτε χρυσὸν μήτε ἄργ.* etc., cf. Franke II. 8. Further, Matt. vi. 20, and 434 Matt. x. 9 compared with Luke ix. 3, throw especial light on the distinction between *οὐδέ* and *οὔτε*.

The succession *οὔτε* . . . *οὔτε* . . . καὶ οὐ Jno. v. 37 f., as the interpretation which has latterly become usual connects the clauses, would be no more liable to grammatical objection than *οὔτε* . . . τε οὐ Hm. Soph. Antig. 759; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. p. 68; yet the clause with καὶ . . . οὐ does not sustain quite the same relation as if *οὔτε* were employed. I consider it, therefore, preferable not to comprehend καὶ . . . οὐ in the partition. See Mey. in loc.

From what has been said it follows further,

a) *οὐδέ* . . . *οὐδέ*, *μηδέ* . . . *μηδέ*, in the sense of *neither* . . . *nor* (when a single negation does not precede), cannot be correlative 456 (on Thuc. 1, 142 see Poppo in loc., and on Xen. Anab. 3, 1, 27th ed. the same author's Index to the Anab. p. 535); but where one negation is annexed to another, or where a series of negations occurs, the first is expressed by *οὐ* or *μή*, and only in this way is a foundation laid for the antithetical disjunctive *δέ*.² Mark viii. 26 *λέγων, μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθης μηδὲ εἰπῆς τινί* etc. cannot signify *neque* . . . *neque*; but the first *μηδέ* denotes *ne* . . . *quidem*, and the second *also not* (*nor*), see Mey. in loc. Cf. Eurip. Hippol. 1052 and Klotz, Devar. 708. The case is different when the first *οὐδέ* connects the clause to what precedes, as e.g. in the case of *οὐδὲ γάρ* in Gal. i. 12 *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρ. παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὐδὲ ἐδιδάχθην*, yet on this passage see below, p. 492.

b) as *οὔτε* and *μήτε* always introduce co-ordinate members of a partition, *μήτε* is incongruous in Mark iii. 20 *ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι μήτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν*,³ for *μὴ φαγ.* here is dependent on *δύνασθαι*.

¹ Hence *Mith.* 1444 does not express himself with accuracy.

² On *οὐδέ* and *μηδέ* after an affirmative sentence, see *Engelhardt*, *Plat. Lach.* p. 64 sq.; *Franke*, p. 6, 8 sq.

³ That even in the latest edition of *Griesbach's* N. T. *μήτε* should remain unchanged,

As the text now stands it can only mean: *that they neither had* 512 *power, nor ate* (the first *μή* being used for *μήτε*). The sense, however, obviously is: *that they were not able (not) even [so much as] to eat*; accordingly, *μηδέ* must be restored on the authority of the better Codd. (see Fr. in loc.), which has been done by Lchm. and Tdf., but not by Scholz. In the same way we must read in Mark v. 3 *οὐδὲ ἀλύσει*, in Luke xii. 26 *οὐδὲ ἐλάχιστον δύνασθε*, in vii. 9 *οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ*,¹ and in Luke xx. 36, where *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται* (as good Codd. read) is not parallel to the preceding sentence *οὔτε . . . οὔτε*, but the confirmation of it: *neque* 435 *enim*.² Cf. also Matt. v. 36. In these passages also Scholz re-
6th ed. printed the old mistakes,

c) as *οὔτε . . . οὔτε* introduce negative members of a partition, and these mutually exclude each other (Hm. Med. p. 332), the reading of some Codd. [Sin. also] *οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι* (which Lchm. and Tdf. [2d ed., not so 7th] have received into the text) in Mark xiv. 68 cannot be supported: *neque novi neque scio* can hardly be said, — the verbs being nearly identical in sense. Cf. Franke II. 13; Schaef. Demosth. III. 449; Fr. in loc. Griesb. has 457 received into the text *οὐκ οἶδα οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι*; cf. Cic. Rosc. Am. 43 7th ed. *non* (not *neque*) *novi neque scio*, which according to the meaning of the two verbs is very suitable.³

d) *οὔτε* may indeed follow *οὐ*, so far forth as *οὐ* as respects sense is to be taken for *οὔτε*, see Hm. as above, p. 333 sqq. 401 and Soph. Antig. p. 110, in opposition to Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 4, 5 and Soph. Oed. T. 817; cf. Franke II. 27 sq.; Maetzner, Antiphon p. 195 sq.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 444; Klotz, as above, 709 sq.⁴ Accord-

is remarkable. What is still more strange, however, is, that Griesbach and Schulz have not even noted the var. *μηδέ* given by approved Codd. See, on the other hand, Scholz in loc.

¹ On the same ground *οὐδέ* should be printed also in Act. apoer. p. 168. Yet Döderlein, Progr. de brachylogia serm. gr. p. 17, considers *οὔτε* correct in such case, maintaining that inasmuch as *τε* like *καί* may denote *etiam* this negation also may be used in the sense of *ne quidem*. See in opposition Franke II. 11.

² Bornemann insists on construing *οὔτε* with the following *καί* (see no. 7 below, p. 494), but the clause *καί* *viol* etc. goes with *ισχυροί γὰρ*.

³ When *οὔτε . . . οὔτε* is used, it is true "the two notions are regarded as forming one compound thought" (Mey.); but this supposes that there actually are two notions, which may be connected affirmatively by *as well . . . as*.

⁴ "In rare cases, and in virtue of a rhetorical figure, it is allowable to drop the complementary particle of the one *οὐ*, and so impart to the member thus stripped of its complementary symbol greater apparent independence, and consequently greater rhetorical force; just as we may say in poetry *Not father nor mother*, instead of *Neither father nor mother*," etc. Benfey, as above, 155. Cf. Hm. l.c. 333, 401 and Franke (who differs somewhat) II. 27, (also Döderlein, Progr. de brachylogia p. 6).

ingly, οὔτε¹ in Rev. ix. 21 is unassailable, Mtth. 1448; though the usage in question passes as poetical, Franke II. 28. The same correlation is to be recognized in Rev. v. 4 οὐδεὶς ἄξιός ἐρέθῃ ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλέπειν αὐτό (as Tdf. also reads), cf. Klotz, Devar. II. 709 sq. and the passage adduced there from Aristot. polit. 1, 3, though the writer might also have said: οὐδεὶς ἄξ. ἐρέθῃ οὔτε ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλ. But μή . . . μήτε cannot be tolerated in Eph. iv. 27, where the best MSS. [also Sin.] unite in giving μηδέ, which Lchm. has admitted into the text. This usage is a sort of anacoluthon; in employing οὐ the writer had not yet the subsequent parallel member in view. Sometimes it may even have been adopted purposely, in order to give prominence to the first word. In Rev. xii. 8 also οὐδέ appears to me the more correct expression, and it has been adopted by Knapp. On the other hand, in Jno. i. 25 εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὔτε Ἑβραῖος οὔτε ὁ προφήτης linguistic propriety does not require that οὐδέ should be employed (cf. Hm. Soph. Philoct. p. 140), yet the better Codd. [Sin. also] give it. Likewise in Rev. v. 3 οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, οὐδὲ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὐδὲ βλέπειν αὐτό the relation of the negations is appropriate: *no one . . . nor on the earth, nor . . . to open . . . nor* (not even) *to look upon it.*

e) as to οὔτε (several times) . . . οὐδέ Acts xxiv. 12 f. according to Lchm. and Bornem. from Codd. B [and Sin.] see Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 229; Franke II. 14 sqq.; Klotz, Devar. II. 714. The οὐδέ is not correlative to οὔτε, but commences a new sentence: *they neither found me in the temple . . . nor in the synagogues, . . . nor can they (and they can not) etc.* Most of the Codd., however, give οὔτε vs. 13. Then οὔτε . . . εὐρόν με, . . . οὔτε παραστήσαι δύνανται are regular correlates, and to the first proposition belong οὔτε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς οὔτε κατὰ πόλιν as subordinate members. On Luke xx. 36, see p. 490.

That in negative sentences the subordinate members are introduced by ἤ, has already been stated, § 53, 6. On the other hand, in Acts xvii. 29, according to the reading (adopted by Bornem.) of Cod. D οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομίζειν αὐτε χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ etc., the ἤ is co-ordinate with οὔτε, a usage of which another example could hardly be found, Mtth. Eurip. VII. 178.

¹ Οὐ μετενήσαν ἐκ τῶν φόνων αὐτῶν, οὔτε ἐκ τῶν . . . οὔτε ἐκ τῆς . . . οὔτε ἐκ τῶν etc. (instead of the regular οὐ μετεν. οὔτε ἐκ τῶν φόνων οὔτε etc.) is as allowable as Odys. 9, 136 ff. ἵ' οὐ χρεὼ πείσματος ἔστιν, οὐτ' εὐνὰς βαλέειν, οὔτε πυρμῆσι ἀνάψαι, or Odys. 4, 566, see Klotz, Devar. 710. A var. in Rev. as above has not been noted.

However, as τε ... ἤ is used (Klotz, Devar. II. 742 sq.), οὔτε ... ἤ may also be allowable. But the other authorities omit οὔτε in this passage.

It is more difficult to say whether or not μήτε, οὔτε can be used after μηδέ, οὐδέ. Almost all recent philologists decide in the
514 negative, see Mtth. II. 1446 (Engelhardt, as above, p. 70; Lehmann, Lucian. III. 615 sq.; Franke II. 18, and others), on the ground that when the stronger expression οὐδέ (Mtth. 1444, 1446) precedes, the weaker οὔτε cannot follow, cf. also Fr. Mr. p. 158.¹ Yet in the various editions of Greek authors there occur many passages in which οὐδέ is followed by an οὔτε (Thuc. 3, 48; see Poppo in loc.; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 2; catapl. 15; Plat. Charm. 171 b.; Aristot. physiogn. 6, p. 148 Franz); they are usually emended, however, commonly with more or less MS. authority. That οὔτε and μήτε cannot be strictly *parallel* with οὐδέ and μηδέ, may hold as a general rule (though the reason alleged does not appear to me decisive); yet, when these particles have nothing to do with οὐδέ (or μηδέ) as a *conjunction*, οὔτε (μήτε) may follow οὐδέ (μηδέ) in the two following cases (cf. also Döderlein in Passow's Lexicon under οὐδέ):

a) When οὐδέ means *ne ... quidem* (Klotz, Devar. 711; cf. 2 Macc. v. 10) or *neither* (also not), or connects the negative clause to which δέ points with a preceding clause.² In Gal. i. 12
437 οὐδέ γὰρ ἐγὼ ... παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην the common
6th ed. reading is to be retained, if the passage is rendered: *for neither did I receive it, — nor was I taught it*, or *neque enim ego* (for οὐ γάρ) *accepi didicique* (-ve), cf. Hoogeveen, doct. particul. II. 980 sq. See Plat. Charm. 171 b.; Hom. in Cerer. 22 (Hm. emend. p. 39); Lysias orat. 19 p. 157 Steph. The οὐδέ of good Codd. [even Sin.] for οὔτε is probably a correction.

459 b) When the οὔτε (μήτε) following οὐδέ (μηδέ) is not co-ordinate
7th ed. with the latter, but is subordinate to it, e.g. *I harbor no enmity and I do not counterwork the plans of others nor their undertakings*, Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 11 μηδ' ἐπεσθαι μηδὲ πείθεσθαι μήτε στρατηγῶ μήτε ἄλλω ἄρχοντι (where, however, the first two words are suspicious), Cyrop. 8, 7, 22 μήποτ' ἄσεβες μηδὲν μηδὲ ἀνόσιον μήτε ποιήσητε μήτε βουλεύσητε, Plato, legg. 11, 916 e. The negation

¹ Οὔτε after οὐδέ is upheld by Bornem. Xen. A. p. 26; Hand, as above, p. 13.

² Hand, as above: intelligitur, nexum, quem nonnulli grammatici inter οὐδέ et οὔτε intercedere dixerunt, nullum esse, nisi quod οὐ in voc. οὐδέ cum οὔτε cohacreat. Nam si in aliquibus Hom. locis ista vocc. hoc quidem ordine nexa videntur exhiberi, in iis δέ pertinet ad superiora conjungenda. Cf. Hartung I. 201; Klotz p. 711.

μηδέ is here divided into two members (μήτε . . . μήτε) Dem. Callipp. 718 c.; Judith viii. 18; cf. Held, Plut. Timol. p. 433 sq.; Mtth. 1445; Kühner II. 440. Accordingly Acts xxiii. 8 μη εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, μηδὲ ἀγγελον (μηδὲ εἶναι μήτε ἀγγ.) μήτε πνεῦμα would be admissible, and would find additional support in τὰ 515 ἀμφοτέρα immediately following.¹ Tdf. has so printed the text in his 2d [and 7th] Leipsic edition. The sentence would be simpler, indeed, with μηδὲ πν., or, as the better Codd. [Sin. also] have it, μήτε ἀγγ. μήτε πν.; and this last has been preferred by Lchm. and Bornem. The more usual reading, however, might easily have been introduced as a correction for the more unusual. In 1 Thess. ii. 3, owing to the notions connected, οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ appears to me more suitable (the better Codd. too [Sin. also] have this reading, and Lchm. has so printed); and in general, I think that in *this* case accurate writers would for the sake of perspicuity use ἢ instead of οὔτε, see § 53, 6, p. 440 sq.

In 1 Cor. iii. 2 the best Codd. [Sin. also], instead of the transcriber's error οὔτε as in the received text, give ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐτι νῦν δύνασθε *ne nunc quidem* (cf. Acts xix. 2; Lucian. Hermot. 7; conser. hist. 33 and Fr. Mr. p. 157), so in 2 Thess. ii. 2 εἰς τὸ μη ταχέως σαλευθῆναι . . . μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι μήτε διὰ πνεύματος etc. (Lchm. and Tdf.). In 2 Thess. iii. 8 οὐδέ is the only correct reading. In Luke vii. 9; xii. 27; Acts xvi. 21 Griesb. properly adopted οὐδέ, which should be adopted too in Acts iv. 12. In Jas. iii. 12 recent editors (Lchm. and Tdf. also) give οὔτε ἀλυκὸν γλυκὺ ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ. This reading can only be supported on the assumption that James had in mind as the antecedent member οὔτε δύναται σικῆ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι etc. — harsh on any view it must be confessed —; otherwise we must read οὐδέ which some Codd. give. [So Cod. Sin. also, but with οὕτως preceding.]

Passages like Luke x. 4 μη βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον, μη πήραν μηδὲ ὑπο- 438 δῆματα (*not . . . nor . . . neither*), Matt. x. 9 μη κτήσησθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἀργυρον μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν, μη πήραν εἰς ὀδόν, μηδὲ δύο χιτῶνας, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα etc., present nothing that is singular.

It may be incidentally remarked further, that the distinction between 460 οὐδέ, μηδέ, and καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή, which is explained by Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. 7th ed. p. 65, and still more aptly by Franke II. 8 sq. (καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή after affirmative sentences *and not, yet not, et non, ac non*), as it appears to have a

¹ See Hoogeveen, doctr. particul. I. 751. Kühnöl insists on rendering τὰ ἀμφοτέρα *tria ista*, but by no means vindicates that rendering by Odys. 15, 78 ἀμφοτέρων κῆδος τε καὶ ἀγλαῆ καὶ δνειαρ, since the first two words here, united by τε καὶ, are regarded as a single notion. In Acts, as above, were we to read μηδέ, ἀμφοτέρα still could not mean *tria*: but the writer regards ἀγγ. and πνεῦμα, agreeably to their logical import, as one leading conception.

logical foundation, is observable likewise in the N. T., cf. καὶ οὐ Jno. v. 43; vi. 17; vii. 36; Acts xvi. 7; 2 Cor. xiii. 10, καὶ μὴ Jas. i. 5; iv. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 16; iii. 6; Heb. xiii. 17.

- 516 For passages in Greek authors which especially illustrate the difference between οὐδέ and οὔτε, see Isocr. Areop. p. 345 οὐκ ἀνωμόλιος οὐδὲ ἀτάκτως οὔτε ἐθεράπευον οὔτε ὠργιάζον etc., permut. p. 750 ὥστε μηδένα μοι πύποτε μηδ' ἐν ὀλιγαρχίᾳ μηδ' ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ μήτε ὑβριν μήτε ἀδικίαν ἐγκαλέσαι, Her. 6, 9; Isocr. ep. 8, p. 1016; Xen. Ages. 1, 4; Demosth. Timocr. 481 b. Cf. Mth. p. 1445.

7. In two parallel propositions, sometimes οὔτε (μήτε) is followed, not by another negative, but by a simple copula (καὶ or τε), e.g. Jno. iv. 11 οὔτε ἀντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ, as in Latin *nec haustum habes et puteus* etc. (Hand, Tursell. IV. 133 sqq.), 3 Jno. 10, cf. Arrian. Al. 4, 7, 6 ἐγὼ οὔτε τὴν ἄγαν ταύτην τιμωρίαν Βήσσου ἐπαυῶ . . . καὶ ὑπαχθῆναι Ἀλέξανδρον ξύμφημι etc., Paus. 1, 6, 5 Δημήτριος οὔτε παυτάπασιν ἐξειστήκει Πτολεμαίῳ τῆς χώρας, καὶ τινὰς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων λοχίους διέφθειρεν, Lucian. dial. mar. 14, 1; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 20 (τε is the more frequent, Jacobitz, Lucian. Tox. c. 25; Weber, Demosth. p. 402 sq.) see Hartung, Partik. I. 193; Klotz, Devar. p. 713, 740; Götting. Anzeig. 1831, S. 1188. On the other hand, in Jas. iii. 14 the negation is omitted the second time, or rather affects also the annexed clause: μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας. So also in 2 Cor. xii. 21; Matt. xiii. 15; Mark iv. 12; Jno. xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 27; cf. Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 2, 20; Diod. S. 2, 48; Aelian. anim. 5, 21; Gataker, Advers. miscell. 2, 2, p. 268; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 182; Boissonade, Nicet. p. 390. The converse construction many expositors have asserted is found in Eph. iv. 26 ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε for μὴ ὀργ. καὶ (μὴ) ἁμαρτ. So in Greek authors (even prose) οὐδέ and οὔτε are frequently used in the second member of a sentence, and have to be supplied in the first, see Schaef. Bos, ellips. p. 777; Hm. Soph. Aj. 239, 616; Döderlein, brachylog. p. 5 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 841. This construction, however, which would be extremely harsh for the prose of the N. T., is not necessary in the preceding passage (especially as it does not run μὴτε ἁμαρτ.), see § 43, 2, p. 311 sq. On the other hand, in Luke xviii. 7, according to the accredited reading ὁ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ . . .

- 439 καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, especially if the latter verb means
6th ed. *delay*, the negative particle would be omitted in the second clause,
461 and merely the interrogative μὴ *num* would have to be repeated.
7th ed. Bornem. in the sächs. bibl. Studien I. 69.

οὐδὲ . . . δέ Heb. ix. 12 hardly needs a remark, as οὐ . . . δέ is of so very frequent occurrence.

8. It has frequently been laid down as a rule, that sentences 517 which contain a single negation followed by ἀλλά (δέ), or in which οὐ (μή) forms an antithesis to a preceding affirmative sentence (Matt. ix. 13 Sept. ; Heb. xiii. 9 ; Luke x. 20), are not always (as e.g. Mark v. 39 τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει, where the latter thought exactly overturns the first, Matt. ix. 12 ; x. 34 ; xv. 11 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 7) to be understood as purely negative, but (in consequence of a construction which, though Hebraistic, occurs also in Greek prose) must be rendered : *not so much . . . as* (non tam . . . quam, οὐ τοσούτον . . . ὅσον Heliod. 10, 3 ; Xen. Eph. 5, 11, οὐχ οὕτως . . . ὥς Dio. Chr. 8, 130, οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ Xen. Hell. 7, 1, 2), or : *not only . . . but also*, non solum . . . sed etiam,¹ cf. Blackwall, auct. class. sacr. p. 62 ; Glass. I. 418 sqq. ; Wetst. and Kypke ad Matt. ix. 13 ; Heumann on 1 Cor. x. 23 f. ; Kuinoel, Acta p. 177 ; Haab, Gr. 145 ff. ; Bos, ellips. p. 772 sq., and others (Valcken. Opusc. II. 190 ; ad Dion. H. IV. 2121, 10 ; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. p. lxix.) ; e.g. Acts v. 4 οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ θεῷ *not so much to men* (the apostle Peter), *as to God* etc. ; 1 Cor. xv. 10 οὐκ ἐγὼ δέ (ἐκοπίασα), ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί, Augustine : *non ego solus, sed gratia Dei mecum* (Jno. v. 30) ;² Luke x. 20 μὴ χαίρετε ὅτι . . . χαίρετε δὲ ὅτι etc. nolite tam propterea laetari . . . quam potius.

But in the passages from the N. T. referred to this head, when more closely considered, either

¹ The first sense, *non tam . . . quam*, is the one by far most commonly assumed in the N. T., as the examples which follow show ; and an apparent warrant for it might be found in the fact, that in N. T. Greek the relative negation *non solum . . . sed* is frequently expressed, but *non tam . . . quam* in point of fact never.

² No wonder expositors have been partial to such a weakening of the preceding idiom, since even philologists supposed it necessary to soften a strong expression in passages of the ancients where there was not the slightest occasion. Thus Dion. H. IV. 2111 δόξῃ τὸ ἀνδρεῖον ἐπιτηδεύων οὐκ ἀληθείᾳ is still translated by Reiske : *te fortitudinis studiosum esse opinione magis quam re ipsa*. For a similar impropriety, see Alberti, observ. p. 71. As to the misapprehension of Palairét (obs. p. 236) in reference to Macrobi. Saturn. I. 22, see my grammatische Excursus 8. 155. Cic. off. 2, 8, 27 also is easily disposed of according to the preceding remarks. Moreover, any one may see in Glass. as above, p. 421, how the older Biblical interpreters allowed themselves to be influenced even by doctrinal considerations in explaining this idiom. In 1 Pet. i. 12 the weakening of οὐ . . . δέ into *non tam . . . quam* (see Schott even in the latest edition) arises from misunderstanding διακονεῖν. Flatt in 1 Cor. vii. 4 wanted to have even the simple οὐ restricted by a μόνον. On 1 Cor. ix. 9 the passage of Philo quoted by expositors throws sufficient light.

440 a. an *unconditional* negation is plainly intended, as may be
 64 ed gathered from a careful examination of the context: Matt. ix. 13
 462 ελεον θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, where Christ, using the words of the
 74 ed prophet (Hos. vi. 6), *really* wishes to have mercy (a state of heart)
 518 put in the place of sacrifices (mere symbols), cf. what follows: οὐ
 γὰρ ἤλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτωλούς; Jno. vii. 16 ἡ ἐμὴ
 διδαχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμή, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με, where Jesus speaks
 of the *origin* of his doctrine (vss. 15, 17, 18): *my doctrine* (which
 ye consider mine, cf. vs. 15) *belongs not to me, but to God*,—has
 for its author not me, but God, (Christ calls it ἡ ἐμὴ διδ. in refer-
 ence to the opinion of the Jews, who in the words πῶς οὗτος γράμ-
 ματα οἶδε, μὴ μεμαθηκώς; assumed it to be something acquired by
 means of study),¹ cf. Jno. v. 30²; xii. 44; Jno. vi. 27 ἐργάζεσθε
 μὴ τὴν βρώσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρώσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς
 ζωὴν αἰών., ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει, where Jesus censures
 the conduct of the people who had come to him *as the Messiah*,
 and the thought: *not so much for ordinary food as for heavenly*
 (Kühnöl) would be absurd. As to vs. 26 see Lücke. In 1 Cor.
 vii. 10 Paul makes a distinction between *the Lord's* injunctions
 and *his own*, as he does in vs. 12, inverting the order; for he
 alludes there to Christ's declaration Matt. v. 32. Recent exposi-
 tors are right. As to 1 Cor. xiv. 22 cf. 23 no doubt can exist;
 cf. besides, 1 Cor. x. 24 (Schott) and Mey. in loc., Eph. vi. 12;
 Heb. xiii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 17 and Mey. in loc. Likewise in 2 Cor. vii. 9
 χαίρω οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν in the
 first clause λυπηθῆναι is denied in itself (the thought so far as
 contained in λυπηθ.) and absolutely, but to be taken up again in
 the second clause with an added limitation εἰς μετάνοιαν. So in
non bonus sed optimus (see the note below), *non* cancels *good* (in
 the positive) (*good* he is not), in order straightway to put in its
 place the only correct term *optimus*, (which of course comprehends
 the *bonus* also). Or,

b. in other passages, the absolute negation is on *rhetorical*

¹ Bengel: *non est mea, non ullo modo discendi labore parata.*

² Similar to this would be to say e.g. of a biblical expositor abounding in ancient quotations, *Thy learning is not thy learning, but Weistein's.* The first *thy learning* is put only problematically; and to infer from it that the speaker means actually to ascribe to the party concerned (that) learning in some degree or in a certain respect, is an inference purely grammatical not logical. Hm. Eurip. Alceste. p. 29 had already glanced at *non bonus sed optimus* (Fr. diss. in 2 Cor. II. p. 162). Of a similar kind are the passages cited by Heumann as above: Cic. Arch. 4, 8 se non interfuisse sed egisse, and Vell. Pat. 2, 13 vir non saeculi sui sed omnis aevi optimus. Cf. also 2 Cor. vii. 9.

grounds employed instead of a conditional (relative), not for the purpose of really (logically) cancelling the first conception, but in order to direct undivided attention to the second, so that the first 519 may comparatively disappear (cf. Mey. on Acts v. 4): 1 Thess. iv. 8 (Schott) *rejecteth not man, but God*.¹ Of course he rejects 463 the apostle also, who announces the divine truth; but the inten- 7th ed. tion was to present to the mind with full force the fact, that it is 441 properly God, as the real author of the truth announced, who is 6th ed. rejected. The force of the thought is immediately impaired if rendered: *he rejects not so much man as God*. To give such a translation would be like diluting e.g. an *asyndeton* (the nature of which also is rhetorical) by subjoining a copula. Therefore it appears to me that *οὐκ . . . ἀλλά*, when it logically means *non tam . . . quam*, is always a part of the rhetorical coloring of the composition, and for that reason is to be preserved in the translation (as is done by all good translators). The speaker has chosen *this* negative *designedly*, and the expression is not to be judged of grammatically merely. Whether, however, such is actually the case, is to be determined not according to the impressions of the interpreter, but by the context and the nature of the connected thoughts. In this way the following passages are to be treated: Matt. x. 20 (Schott) *οὐχ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν*, Mark ix. 37 (Schott) *ὅς ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέξηται, οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με*, 1 Cor. xv. 10 *περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοπίασα· οὐκ ἐγὼ δέ, ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί*, Jno. xii. 44 *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ πιστεύει εἰς ἐμέ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με*, Acts v. 4 (cf. Plutarch. apophth. Lac. 41; see Duker, Thuc. 4, 92); Luke x. 20 (where many MSS. insert a *μᾶλλον* after *δέ*); 2 Cor. ii. 5 (Schott). As to Luke xiv. 12 f. see Bornem. and de Wette in loc.²

¹ Cf. Demosth. Energ. 684 b. *ἡγησάμενη ὑβρίσθαι οὐκ ἐμέ* (but he had been abused actually) *ἀλλ' αὐτήν (τὴν βουλὴν) καὶ τὸν θῆμον τὸν ψηφισάμενον* etc., Aesop. 148, 2 *οὐ σὺ με λωιδορεῖς, ἀλλ' ὁ πύργος, ἐν ᾧ ἴστασαι*. Klotz, Devar. p. 9: *οὐκ ἐκινδύνευσεν, ἀλλ' ἔπαθεν* est: *non periclitatus sed passus est*, quibus verbis hoc significatur: non dico istum periclitatum esse sed passum, ita ut, cum ille dicatur passus esse, jam ne cogitetur quidem de eo, quod priori membro dictum est.

² Against this view, propounded in the first edition of this work in accordance with the remarks of *de Wette* (A. L.-Z. 1816 nr. 41 S. 321) and those of a critic in the *Theol. Annal.* 1816 S. 873, *Fr.* dissert. in 2 Cor. II. 162 sq. declared himself. His objections were examined by *Beyer* in the *n. krit. Journ. d. Theol.* 3 B. 1 St.; but *Fr.* discussed the subject anew in his 2d excursus on Mr. p. 773 sq. I had written the above in substance before I received this excursus, and it agrees essentially with the opinion expressed in the second edition of this Grammar S. 177, and in my *grammat.* Excursus S. 155.

tive clause in Demosth. Androt. 420 c.; Aelian. 12, 36). See 521 besides, Matt. xxv. 9 text. rec. Cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 711; Mtth. II. 1449. Or,

b. They both produce but a *single* negation (which is the more frequent case), and serve (originally) only to make the principal negation which would have sufficed alone more distinct and forcible, and to impart to the sentence a negative character throughout:¹ Jno. xv. 5 *χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν non potestis facere quidquam*, i.e. *nihil* pot. fac. (Dem. Callip. 718 c.), 2 Cor. xi. 8 *παρὼν . . . οὐ κατενάρκησα οὐδενός*, Acts xxv. 24 *ἐπιβωῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτὸν ζῆν μηκέτι*, Mark xi. 14 *μηκέτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκ σοῦ μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγη*, 1 Cor. i. 7 *ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματος*, Matt. xxii. 16; Mark i. 44; v. 37; vii. 12; ix. 8; xii. 34; xv. 4 f.; Matt. xxiv. 21; Luke iv. 2; viii. 43 (51 var.); x. 19; xx. 40; xxii. 16; Jno. iii. 27; v. 30; vi. 63; ix. 33; xvi. 23 f.; xix. 41; Acts viii. 16, 39; Rom. xiii. 8; 1 Cor. viii. 2 (var.); 2 Cor. vi. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 6; 1 Jno. i. 5; Rev. xviii. 4, 11, 14, etc.² So in particular where the notion *every, always, every time, everywhere*, is added to the negative clause for its necessary or rhetorical amplification (Böckh, nott. Pind. p. 418 sq.),³ or where the negation is decomposed, Matt. xii. 32 *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι*.⁴ In this way a single sentence may contain a series of negatives: Luke xxiii. 53 *οὐ οὐκ ἦν οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς κείμενος*, Mark v. 3 (cf. Aelian. anim. 11, 31 *ὥς οὐδεπώποτε οὐδένα οὐδὲν ἀδικήσας*, Plat. Parmen. 166 a. *ὅτι τὰλλα τῶν μὴ ὄντων οὐδενὶ οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς οὐδεμίαν κοινωνίαν ἔχει*, Phaed. 78 d.; Her. 2, 39 *οὐδὲ ἄλλου οὐδενὸς ἐμφύχου κεφαλῆς γεύσεται Αἰγυπτίων οὐδεὶς*, Lysias pro Mantith. 10; Xenoph. A. 2, 4, 28; Plat. Phil. 29 b. and soph. 249 b.; Lucian. chronol. 13; Dio C. 635, 40; 402, 35; 422, 24); see Wyttenb. Plat. Phaed. p. 199; Ast, Plat. polit. p. 541; Boisson. Philostr. Her. p. 446 and Nicet. p. 243, especially also Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 13;

¹ As in popular German; yet the accumulation of negatives is genuine German, and has been expelled from the language of the educated only through the influence of the Latin, which so thoroughly pervades our literary culture. As to Latin, see Jani, *ars poet. lat.* p. 236 sq.

² In the Sept. cf. Gen. xlv. 1; Num. xvi. 15; Exod. x. 23; Deut. xxxiv. 6; Josh. ii. 11; 1 Sam. xii. 4, especially Hos. iv. 4 *ὅπως μηδεὶς μήτε δικάζηται μήτε ἐλέγχηται μηδεὶς*. Transcribers have in such sentences sometimes omitted a negative, see Fr. Mr. p. 107.

³ But this mode of expression is not always employed, cf. Acts x. 14 *οὐδέποτε ἐφαγὼν πᾶν κρεὶν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον* (without var.), 1 Jno. iv. 12.

⁴ Klotz, Devar. II. 698: in hac enuntiatione ita repetita est negatio, quod unumquodque orationis membrum, quia eo amplificabatur sententia, quasi per se stare videbatur.

Gayl. p. 382 sq. When οὐδέ *ne* . . . *quidem* is employed, it is usual
522 in Greek to prefix another negative to the verb (cf. Stallb. Plat.
rep. I. 279; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 460). So Luke xviii. 13 οὐκ
ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπάραι.

In 1 Cor. vi. 10, after several antecedent partitive clauses (οὔτε, οὔτε,
οὐ, οὐ), the negative is once more repeated for the sake of perspicuity with
466 the predicate βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι. The best Codd., how-
7th ed. ever, [Sin. also] omit it, and Lchm. has expunged it. In Rev. xxi. 4 ὁ
θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, οὔτε πένθος οὔτε κραυγὴ οὔτε πόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, the
writer might also without hesitation have dispensed with the second οὐ.
444 What comes nearest, however, is Aesch. Ctesiph. 285 b. οὐδέ γε ὁ ποιητὴς
6th ed. οὐκ ἂν ποτε γένοιτο δημοσίᾳ χρηστός, see Bremi in loc. (c. 77), cf. also Plat.
rep. 4, 426 b. and Hm. Soph. Antig. as above. On the other hand, οὐκ
ἔσται ἔτι οὔτε πένθος etc. would be quite according to rule. In Acts xxvi. 26
the text. rec. gives λανθάνει αὐτόν τι τούτων οὐ πείθουμαι οὐδέν; but the better
Codd. omit either οὐδέν or τι. [Yet οὐθέν *with* τι is found in Cod. Sin.*]

On the pleonasm of μή after verbs in which the idea of negation is
already contained, see § 65, 2, p. 604.

Note. A peculiar kind of negation is formed with εἰ in oaths by virtue
of an aposiopesis of the apodosis; as, Mark viii. 12 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ
δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον i.e. *no* sign will be given; Heb. iii. 11;
iv. 3 Sept. ὥμοσα, εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν καταπαυσίν μου. This is an
imitation of the Hebrew ׀ (cf. Gen. xiv. 23; Deut. i. 35; 1 Kings i. 51;
ii. 8; 2 Kings iii. 14, etc.), and a form of imprecation must always be
supplied as the apodosis: in the last passage, *then will I not live, not be
Jehovah*; in passages where the speaker is a man, *so may God punish me*
(cf. 1 Sam. iii. 17; 2 Sam. iii. 35), *then will I not live*, and the like; Ewald
krit. Gr. 661, (cf. Aristoph. equit. 698 f. εἰ μὴ σ' ἐκφάγω . . . οὐδέποτε βιώσομαι,
Cic. fam. 9, 15, 7 *moriar*, si habeo). Ἐάν is thus used in Neh. xiii. 25;
Song of Sol. ii. 7; iii. 5 Sept. Of the opposite, ἐὰν μὴ or εἰ μὴ (affirmatively),
no instance occurs in the N. T. (cf. Ezek. xvii. 19), for most unwarrantably
has Haab S. 226 referred to this head Mark x. 30; 2 Thess. ii. 3.

§ 56. CONSTRUCTION OF NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

1. The (subjective) negative μή *ne* (with its compounds) is used
in *independent* sentences to express a negative wish or a warning,
and is construed

523 a. With the Optative (Aor.) — the mood which would be used
also without the negation — when a negative wish is expressed
(Franke I. 27), e.g. in the frequently recurring μὴ γένοιτο Luke
xx. 16; Rom. iii. 6; ix. 14; Gal. ii. 17 (Sturz, dial. Alex. 204 sq.),

and in *μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθεῖν* 2 Tim. iv. 16 (Plat. legg. 11, 918 d.). So also *μηκέτι*, according to the text. rec., Mark xi. 14 *μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι* *may no one ever again* etc. The Subjunctive *φάγῃ*, however, would here be more appropriate in the mouth of Christ, — if it only had more external authority in its favor. Besides, see Gayler p. 76 sqq. 82.

b. When a warning is expressed, it is construed α) sometimes with the Imperative Present, usually where something permanent and which a person is already doing is to be indicated (Hm. Vig. 467 809), Matt. vi. 19 *μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν*, vii. 1 *μὴ κρῖνετε*, Jno. v. 14 ^{7th ed.} *μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε*, cf. Matt. xxiv. 6,¹ 17; Jno. xiv. 1; xix. 21; Mark xiii. 7, 11; Rom. xi. 18; Eph. iv. 28; 1 Tim. v. 23; 1 Pet. iv. 12; 445 β) sometimes with the Subjunctive Aorist, when something trans- ^{6th ed.} sient, which should not be begun at all, is to be expressed (Hm. as above), Luke vi. 29 *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς*, Matt. x. 34 *μὴ νομίσητε* (do not conceive), *ὅτι ἦλθον* etc., vi. 13; Luke xvii. 23; Acts xvi. 28. So in legislative prohibitions, Matt. vi. 7; Mark x. 19; Col. ii. 21, where not the repetition or continuation, but the action itself (though done but once) is interdicted, and absolutely. The Aor. Imperat., which specially has this signification, and is not at all rare in later writers (Gayl. p. 64),² does not occur in the N. T. (and is doubtful in the Sept. also). On the other hand, the Pres. Imperat. also is often used in reference to what should not be begun at all (Hm. as above, Franke I. 30); cf. Matt. ix. 30; Eph. v. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Jno. iii. 7. In general, see Hm. de praeceptis Atticistar. p. 4 sqq. (Opusc. I. 270 sqq.); cf. Soph. Aj. p. 163; Bhdy. 393 f.; Franke I. 28 sqq. The Imperat. and Subjunctive are both employed in one sentence in Luke x. 4.

The Pres. Imperat. is also construed with *μή* in Rom. xiii. 8 *μηδὲν μὴδὲν ὀφείλετε*; for owing to the subjective negatives *ὀφείλω* cannot be taken as an Indicative. Reiche's observations on the other side are a strange mixture of obscurity and half-truth. And if he means to say that the subjective negatives are used in the same way in some of the passages 524 adduced by Wetstein, he is very much mistaken; for in these passages the Inf. or Participle is employed, both of which regularly take *μή*.

As to *οὐ* with the Fut. Indic., partly in passages from the O. T. law, as

¹ There must here be a comma after *δρᾶτε*, as H. Stephanus correctly remarked in the preface to his edition of the N. T. of 1576. If *δρᾶτε μή* be immediately connected, *θροῆσθε* must be substituted for *θροεῖσθε*. Tdf. [in his 2d ed.] has not attended to this. [In his 1st ed. and 7th he has it correctly.]

² Cf. Bremi, excurs. 12 ad Lys. p. 452 sqq.

Matt. v. 21 οὐ φοβέσθε, xix. 18; Acts xxiii. 5; Rom. xiii. 9, and partly in the N. T. style itself, Matt. vi. 5 οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς περ οἱ ὑποκριταί, where μή with the Subjunctive might have been expected, cf. § 43, 5. Not unlike this is Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 34; see Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 204; Franke I. 24. (On μή with the Fut. Indic. in a mildly prohibitive sense, see Weber, Demosth. p. 369.)

When μή in a prohibitive sense is joined with the *third* Person (as frequently in laws, see Franke, as above, p. 32), the Imperat. is used (always in the N. T.), not the Subjunctive (Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 163): the *Present* Imper. when what is forbidden has already commenced, and the *Aorist* Imper. when something which has not yet commenced is to be avoided (in future also); as, Rom. vi. 12 μή οὖν βασιλεύτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι, xiv. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13; Col. ii. 16; 1 Tim. vi. 2; Jas. i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 8; on the other hand Matt. vi. 3 μὴ γινώτω ἡ ἀριστερά σου etc., xxiv. 18 μὴ ἐπιστρέψάτω ὀπίσω, Mark xiii. 15 μὴ καταβῶτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν (probably also in Matt. xxiv. 17 according to good Codd. [Sin. also], where the text. rec. has καταβαινέτω). Cf. Xen. C. 7, 5, 73; 8, 7, 26; Aeschin. Ctes. 282 c.; Mth. II. 1157; Kühner II. 113. (Instances from the Sept., therefore, are not needed here; otherwise, besides Deut. xxxiii. 6 and 1 Sam. xvii. 32, many could be found, as Josh. vii. 3; 1 Sam. xxv. 25; 2 Sam. i. 21; Judges vi. 39.)

If a dehortation in the 1st Pers. (Plur.) is to be expressed, μή takes the Subjunctive, and either the Pres. or the Aor. according to the distinction indicated above (Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 162), e.g. Jno. xix. 24 μὴ σχίσωμεν, but 1 Jno. iii. 18 μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγον (as some were doing), Gal. vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 6; Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. x. 8. In Gal. v. 26 the Codd. vary, some having μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι (text. rec.), others γενώμεθα. The better [Sin. also] favor the former, (and Lchm. and Tdf. have so printed). The apostle may mean to reprove a failing already existing in the churches, as seems probable also from what precedes. Mey. takes a different view. From Greek authors, see evidence for the use of the 1st Pers. Plur. Subj. in Gayler 72 sq.

2. In *dependent* clauses μή (μήπως, μήποτε etc.) is used,
- 525 a. In the sense of *in order that not* (for which ἵνα μή is more commonly employed), with the Subjunctive after Pres. and Imperf. 1 Cor. ix. 27 ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα . . . μήπως . . . ἀδόκιμος γένομαι, 2 Cor. ii. 7; xii. 6; Matt. v. 25; xv. 32; Luke xii. 58 and frequently; with the Optative after a Preterite, Acts xxvii. 42 τῶν

στρατιωτῶν βουλή ἐγένετο, ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνωσι, μή τις ἐκκολυμβήσας διαφύγοι, but good Codd. [Sin. also] have here διαφύγη, which Lchm. and Tdf. have adopted (Bhdy. 401; Krü. 168). The latter reading, however, may be a correction or an error of transcribers. The Subj. is also used in the O. T. quotation Matt. xiii. 15; Acts xxviii. 27, where, however, as a *permanent* result is meant, it is less questionable. The Indic. Fut. (along with a Subj. Aor.) Mark iv. 12 Sept. μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἀφελθήσεται (according to good Codd.) [as also the Fut. βληθήσῃ Matt. v. 25] it is not necessary to regard as likewise dependent on μήποτε, though even then the Fut. would be quite proper, see Fr. This applies to ἰάσονται Acts xxviii. 27 (Born. ἰάσωμαι) cf. Luke xiv. 8f. In Matt. vii. 6 Lchm. and Tdf. read μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν, where Griesb. and Scholz have not noted any var.

b. In the sense of *that not, lest*, after ὅρα, βλέπε or φοβοῦμαι, and the like (Hm. Vig. 797; Rost, Gr. 650f.). In this connection the particle is followed

α) by the Indicative, when the suspicion (apprehension) that something is, will be, or has been, a matter of fact, is also expressed: *Present* Indic. Luke xi. 35 σκόπει, μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν (Hm. Soph. Aj. 272 μὴ ἐστὶ verentis quidem est ne quid nunc sit, sed indicantis simul, putare se ita esse, ut veretur, 469 cf. Gayl. 317 sq.); Protev. Jacobi 14¹; *Future* Indic. Col. ii. 8 ^{7th ed} βλέπετε, μὴ τις ἔσται ὑμᾶς ὁ συλαγωγῶν ne futurus sit, ne existat, qui etc. Heb. iii. 12; Mark xiv. 2; Her. 3, 36; Plat. Cratyl. 393 c.; Achill. Tat. 6, 2 (p. 837 Jac.); Xen. C. 4, 1, 18 etc. (cf. Stallb. 447 Plat. rep. I. 336); *Preterite* Indic. after a Pres. Gal. iv. 11 φοβοῦμαι ^{6th ed} ὑμᾶς, μήπως εἰκὴ κεκοπίακα (may have labored), see Hm. Eurip. Med. p. 356; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 135; Stallb. Plat. Menon p. 98 sqq.; 526 cf. Thuc. 3, 53; Plato, Lys. 218 d.; Diog. L. 6, 5; Lucian. Piscat. 15 (Job i. 5), see Gayl. 317, 320.

β) by the Subjunctive (Gayl. 323 sqq.), when the object of a

¹ We cannot with de Wette pronounce this acceptance inappropriate on the ground that "simply a general warning is here expressed." That is just the question. An injunction to examine carefully lest such might be the case, Jesus might certainly give to his contemporaries, according to the assumption elsewhere made in the N. T. respecting their predominant religious character; and this injunction is in reality general. Let every one take care lest the second of the cases mentioned in vs. 34 should apply to him. The apprehension that Jesus would thus be countenancing the doctrine of the complete depravation of man's reason is groundless; and Niemeyer (Hall. Pred.-Journ. 1832. Nov.) should not have been induced by such apprehension to take the Indicative for the Subjunctive, — an interpretation which he supports, moreover, by passages of a totally different nature.

mere apprehension, which may perhaps prove groundless, is indicated: by the *Present* Subj. Heb. xii. 15 Sept. ἐπισκοποῦντες . . . μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας . . . ἐνοχλῇ (Hm. Soph. Aj. 272 μή ἦ verentis est, ne quid nunc sit, simulque nescire se utrum sit nec ne significantis); usually by the *Aorist* Subj. in reference to something still future, Matt. xxiv. 4 βλέπετε, μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ, 2 Cor. xi. 3 φοβοῦμαι, μήπως . . . φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν, xii. 20; Luke xxi. 8; Acts xiii. 40; 1 Cor. viii. 9; x. 12. The same mood is employed in narration after a Pret. Acts xxiii. 10 εὐλαβηθεὶς μή διασπασθῇ . . . ἐκέλευσε, xxvii. 17, 29, as after words of *fearing* (where the fear appears to be well founded, Rost S. 650) even in the best Greek prose authors, Xen. A. 1, 8, 24 Κύρος δέισας, μή ὀπισθεν γεγόμενος κατακόψῃ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, Cyr. 4, 5, 48 πολὺν φόβον ἡμῶν παρείχετε, μή τι πάθῃτε, Lysias caed. Eratosth. 44 δ ἐγὼ δεδιώς μή τις πύθῃται ἐπεθύμουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι, cf. also Thuc. 2, 101; Plato, Euthyd. 288 b.; Herod. 4, 1, 3; 6, 1, 11; see Mith. II. 1189; Bornem. Xen. sympos. p. 70; Gayl. 324 f. The Indic. Fut. and Subjunct. are connected in 2 Cor. xii. 20 f. φοβοῦμαι, μήπως οὐχ οἷους θέλω εὐρῶ ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ εὐρεθῶ ὑμῶν . . . μή πάλιν ἐλθόντος μου ταπεινώσει με ὁ θεός etc.

In this way we must judge of elliptical passages also (Gayl. 327), such
 70 as Matt. xxv. 9 μήποτε οὐκ ἄρκῃσιν ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν *lest there be not enough*, i.e.
 71 *it is to be feared that there may not be enough* (according to the text. rec., where, however, recent critics read μήποτε οὐ μὴ ἄρκῃσιν, though without decidedly preponderant authority; and then μήποτε is taken by itself: *no, in no wise*). Rom. xi. 21 εἰ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μήπως οὐδὲ σοὺ φείσεται (far better supported than φείσεται) *if God has not spared, (I fear and presume) that he will not spare thee also*, ne tibi quoque non sit parciturus, cf. Gen. xxiv. 39.

In Gal. ii. 2 ἀνέβην . . . ἀνέθιμην . . . μήπως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, Fr. (Conject. I. note, p. 50) considered the translation *ne operam meam luderem aut lusissem* faulty in two respects: because instead of τρέχω (after a Preterite) the Optative was to be expected; while the Indic.
 448 ἔδραμον here would mean, what the apostle cannot have intended to say,
 449 *that he had labored in vain*. Hence Fr. took the words as a direct question: *num frustra operam meam in evangelium insumo an insumsi?* He himself,
 527 however, afterwards felt that this explanation is forced, and in the Opuscula Fritzscheorum p. 173 sq. gave a different rendering. The difficulty in regard to τρέχω entirely disappears, so far as the N. T. is concerned; indeed, the Pres. Subj.¹ is even appropriate, as Paul is speaking of apos-

¹ That τρέχω is Indicative [as is assumed again by *Bttm. Gramm. des N. T. Sprachgebr.* S. 303 and even *Mey. Aufl.* 4] *Usteri* and *Schott* inferred from the fact that *δραμον*

tolic activity, still *continued*. And the Pret. Indic. ἔδραμον would be justified by the assumption that Paul gave to the whole sentence the same turn of expression that he would have employed, had he uttered the words in a direct form: *in order that I run not or have run* (for *might run*, or *might have run*), cf. above, p. 288. Still simpler, however, is the interpretation now adopted by Fr., who takes the Preterite in a hypothetical sense, cf. Mtth. II. 1185; Hm. de partic. ἄν p. 54: *ne forte frustra cucurrissem* (which might easily have been the case, had I not propounded my doctrine in Jerusalem). But of course, it is not allowable to refer ἀνεθέμην (as Fr. does) to an intention of Paul to instruct himself (for not the mere exposition of his views could have secured him from *having run in vain*, but only the assent of the apostles); on the contrary, Paul must have been satisfied in his own mind that his views were correct, and only have designed to obtain the very important declaration of the apostles in his favor, without which his apostolic labors for the present and the past would have been fruitless, see de Wette in loc.

In 1 Thess. iii. 5 μήπως is construed with both Indic. and Subjunct.: ἐπεμψα εἰς τὸ γνῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν, μήπως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν *I sent to ascertain your faith, (fearing) lest haply the tempter have tempted you, and my labor be fruitless*. The different moods here are obviously justifiable. The temptation (to waver 471 in faith) might have already taken place; but whether the apostle's labor 7th ed. had been rendered fruitless by it depended on the result of the temptation, as yet not known to him, and might be dreaded as impending. Fr.'s interpretation (Opusc. Fritzschor. p. 176): *ut ... cognoscerem, an forte Satanas vos tentasset et ne forte labores mei irriti essent*, appears to me harsh, as μήπως would thus be taken in two senses. And I can by no means admit that according to my interpretation the Fut. γενήσεται would be required instead of γένηται. On the contrary, the Fut. denoting an apprehension which cannot be verified, and in any event will not be verified at some definite future time, would be far too explicit. See also Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 48 and partic. ἄν p. 126 sq.; Mtth. II. 1186.

Note. Verbs of *fearing* are regularly followed by the simple μή, μήπως, etc. not by ἵνα μή: hence in Acts v. 26 ἵνα μὴ λησασθῶσιν must not be connected with ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν, as is done by most expositors (even Mey.); but it is dependent, rather, on ἤγαγεν αὐτοὺς οὐ μετὰ βίας, and the 449 words ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν are to be considered as parenthetical. 6th ed.

3. The intensive οὐ μὴ (in reference to what *in no wise* will 528 or should take place)¹ is construed sometimes, and indeed most

follows; forgetting that two different moods, according to different conceptions, may be and sometimes are connected with one and the same particle. (See the passage to be quoted immediately: 1 Thess. iii. 5.)

¹ Thus οὐ μὴ regularly refers to the future (Matt. xxiv. 21 οἱ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν ... οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται). Moreover, it is now the prevalent opinion of scholars, that this idiom

frequently, with the Subjunct. Aorist, sometimes with the Subjunct. Present (Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 51, see below), and sometimes also with the Indic. Fut. (Bengel on Matt. v. 18 is mistaken), see Ast, Plat. polit. p. 365; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 36 sq.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 409 sqq.; Gayl. p. 430 sqq. The difference between the Subj. Aor. and the Fut. Indic. (which alone occur in the N. T.) is defined by Hm. Soph. Oed. Col. ver. 853 thus: *Conjunctivo Aor.* locus est aut in eo, quod jam actum est (see, however, Ellendt as above, p. 411 sq.), aut in re incerti temporis, sed semel vel brevi
 472 temporis momento agenda; *Futuri* vero usus, quem ipsa verbi
 7th ed. forma nunnisi in rebus futuris versari ostendit, ad ea pertinet, quae aut diuturniora aliquando eventura indicare volumus aut non aliquo quocunque, sed remotiore aliquo tempore dicimus futura esse. The inquiry whether this distinction is observed in the N. T., is rendered difficult by the variations of MSS., of which, in many passages, some have the Indic. Fut., and some the Aor. Subj. So far as can be ascertained by the present apparatus of various readings, the Subj. is established in Matt. v. 18, 20, 26; x. 23; xviii. 3; xxiii. 39; Mark xiii. 2, 19, 30; Luke vi. 37; xii. 59; xiii. 35; xviii. 17, 30; xxi. 18; Jno. viii. 51; x. 28; xi. 26, 56; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. viii. 13; 2 Pet. i. 10; Rev. ii. 11; iii. 3, 12; xviii. 7, 21 f.; xxi. 25, 27. There is a preponderance of evidence for the Subj. in Matt. xvi. 28; xxvi. 35; Mark ix. 41; xvi. 18; Luke i. 15; ix. 27; xviii. 7, 30; xxii. 68; Jno. vi. 35;
 529 viii. 12, 52; xiii. 8; Rom. iv. 8; Gal. v. 16; 1 Thess. v. 3. There is at least as much evidence for the Subj. as for the Fut. in Mark xiv. 31; Luke xxi. 33; Matt. xv. 5; xxiv. 35; Gal. iv. 30; Heb. x. 17; Rev. ix. 6 (xviii. 14).¹ The authorities decidedly favor

is to be considered as elliptical: οὐ μὴ παύσῃ for οὐ δέδωκα or οὐ φόβος, οὐ θεός ἐστὶ (there is no fear) μὴ π. see Ast, Plat. polit. p. 365; *Matthiae*, Eurip. Hippol. p. 24; Sprachl. II. 1174; Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 1028; *Hartung* II. 156. This involves, indeed, the assumption that the Greeks lost sight of the origin of the expression; for in many passages "there is no fear that" is not appropriate, (in the N. T. Matt. v. 20; xviii. 3; Luke xxii. 16; Jno. iv. 48). Earlier Hm. (Eurip. Med. p. 390 sq.) had explained the phrase differently, cf. also Gayl. p. 402. The connective οὐδὲ μὴ (καὶ οὐ μὴ) occurs in the N. T. only in Rev. vii. 16 (var.), but frequently in the Sept. e.g. Exod. xxii. 21; xxiii. 13; Josh. xxiii. 7; and οὐδέμ μὴ in Wisd. i. 8. Generally, οὐ μὴ is of very frequent occurrence in the Sept., and its prevalence may probably be referred to that effort after expressiveness, characteristic of the later language. The instances have been collected by Gayl. p. 441 sqq. It is not the fact, however, that in the N. T. (*Hütz*, Joh. Marc. S. 106) Mark and the Revelation display a predilection for οὐ μὴ. A concordance will prove the contrary.

¹ It must not be overlooked that sometimes the Future form may be occasioned in MSS. by a preceding or following Future, as in Jno. viii. 12 οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃς . . . ἀλλ' ἔτι.

the Fut. in Luke x. 19; xxii. 34; Jno. iv. 14; x. 5. The Fut. is 450 established (without var.) in Matt. xvi. 22 οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο ^{5th ed.} (absit) ne tibi accidat hoc. Accordingly the Subj. is indisputably predominant in the N. T. (cf. Lob. Phryn. p. 722 sq.), and this is no less the case in Greek authors, see Hartung, Partik. II. 156 f. Hermann's rule on the whole does not apply to the N. T.; for although several passages might be interpreted in accordance with it, yet others in turn are at variance with it, and the Aor. is employed where the Fut. should have been used, as e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 15 ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας, where the point of time is very definitely in mind viz. *on the day of Christ's second coming*; and Heb. viii. 11, where in οὐ μὴ διδάξωσι there is reference to a precise time (the Messianic period, vs. 10), and duration also is indicated, cf. Rev. xxi. 25. In fact, the Subj. Aor. in the sense of the Future had become usual in later Greek, cf. Lob. as above, p. 723; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 57. Mdv. also S. 127 discovers no perceptible difference between the Fut. and the Aor. in this construction. (Gayl. 440 sqq. has catalogued all the passages in the Sept. where οὐ μὴ occurs.)

The statement of Dawes, however, which recognizes no difference of meaning between the Aor. and Fut. in this construction, but as respects the former allows only the 2d Aor. Act. (and Mid.) in Greek texts, has been almost universally rejected (see Mth. II. 1175 f.; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 343; on the other hand, Bhdy. 402 f.), and cannot be applied to the N. T., where the 1st Aor. is as frequent as the 2d Aor. even in verbs 473 that have a 2d Aor. in common use, (var. see Rev. xviii. 14). ^{7th ed.}

Sometimes οὐ μὴ is followed, according to a few Codd., by a *Present* Indic., viz. in Jno. iv. 48 εἰ μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδῃτε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύετε, and Heb. xiii. 5 Sept. οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλείπω; indeed, one Cod. (quoted by Griesb.) has in Rev. iii. 12 the Optative, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθοι. The last is undoubtedly only a mistake of a transcriber, misled by the ear (the case is different in the orat. obliq. in Soph. Philoct. 611, Schaeff. in loc.; cf. also the same on Demosth. II. 321), and the Subjunctive was long ago restored. Likewise in Heb. as above, ἐγκαταλίπω is undoubtedly the true reading. But in Jno. iv. 48 perhaps the reading ought to be πιστεύῃτε, as the Subj. 530 *Present* is so used in Greek authors also, as in Soph. Oed. Col. 1024 οὐ μὴ ποτε χώρας φυγόντες τῆςδ' ἐπεύχωνται θεοῖς (according to Hm. and others), Xen. C. 8, 1, 5; An. 2, 2, 12 (see Hm. Eurip. Med. Elmsl. p. 390; Stallb. Plat. polit. p. 51; Ast, Plat. pol. p. 365), and, as in the passage from John, after a conditional clause with εἰ in Xen. Hier. 11, 15 εἰ μὴ τοὺς φίλους κρατῆς εὖ ποίων, οὐ μὴ σοι δύνωνται ἀντέχειν οἱ πολέμοι, and

frequently in Demosth. (Gayl. p. 437). In John, however, there is preponderant MS. authority [to which Sin. must be added] for *πιστεύετε*, which Lchm. and Tdf. have adopted. What Hm. Iphig. Taur. p. 102 says of an Indic. Pres. after *οὐ μὴ*, the received text would hardly substantiate. As to Luke xviii. 7 see § 57, 3 and p. 494.

This intensive *οὐ μὴ* is used also in dependent clauses: not merely in relative clauses Matt. xvi. 28; Luke xviii. 30; Acts xiii. 41, but also in 451 objective clauses with *ὅτι* Luke xiii. 35; xxii. 16; Matt. xxiv. 34; Jno. 6th ed. xi. 56 *τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν; what think ye? that he will not come to the feast?* Likewise in direct question with *τίς*, Rev. xv. 4 *τίς οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇ;* Cf. with the former passages, Xen. C. 8, 1, 5 *τοῦτο γὰρ εἰ εἰδέναι χρή, ὅτι οὐ μὴ δύνῃται* Kṓpos εἰρεῖν etc. Thuc. 5, 69; and with the latter, Neh. ii. 3 *διὰ τί οὐ μὴ γένηται πονηρόν* etc. On *οὐ μὴ* in an interrogative clause, without an interrogative pronoun, construed with a Subjunctive or a Future (Ruth iii. 1), see § 57, 3, p. 511 sq.

Note. *Not . . ., no one . . ., nothing . . . except*, is commonly expressed by *οὐ . . ., οὐδεὶς . . ., οὐδέν . . . εἰ μὴ*, as in Matt. xi. 27; xxi. 19; Luke iv. 26; Jno. xvii. 12, etc. (Klotz, Devar. p. 524). More rarely the negation is followed by *πλήν*, as in Acts xx. 23; xxvii. 22; ᾧ is found only in Jno. xiii. 10 text. rec.: *ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν ἢ τοὺς πόδας νύσασθαι*. Most Codd. have *εἰ μὴ*, and this Lchm. has adopted. The latter, however, may be a correction of the rarer ᾧ, which yet occasionally occurs, Xen. C. 7, 5, 41.

§ 57. INTERROGATIVE PARTICLES.

1. In the N. T., interrogative sentences (cf. Krü. 250 f.) which commence neither with an interrogative pronoun, nor with a special interrogative adverb (*πῶς, ποῦ* etc.),

474 a. if *direct*, have usually no interrogative particle (Jno. vii. 23; 7th ed. xiii. 6; xix. 10; Acts xxi. 37; Luke xiii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 2; Rom. 581 ii. 21; Gal. iii. 21, etc.).¹ Sometimes, however, contrary to the usage of the written language of the Greeks, *εἰ* is employed before a question in which the inquirer merely discloses his uncertainty, without intimating that he expects a reply (see no. 2).

b. if *indirect*, they are introduced by *εἰ* (which is here, too, the conditional conjunction).²

¹ Hence it is sometimes matter of dispute among commentators whether a particular sentence is to be taken as interrogative or not, e.g. Jno. xvi. 31; Rom. viii. 33; xiv. 22; 1 Cor. i. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 1; xii. 19; Heb. x. 2; Jas. ii. 4; or how many words are comprehended in an interrogation, e.g. Jno. vii. 19; Rom. iv. 1. On this, Grammar can ordinarily give no decision.

² How *εἰ* acquires the general force of an interrogative particle, see Hartung, Parik. II. 201 ff.; cf. Klotz, Devar. 508.

In direct double questions *πότερον* . . . *ἤ* is used only once, Jno. vii. 17 ; elsewhere the first question is without an interrogative particle, Luke xx. 4 ; Gal. i. 10 ; iii. 2 ; Rom. ii. 3, etc., and only the second has *ἤ*, — if negative, *ἢ οὐ* Matt. xxii. 17 ; Luke xx. 22, or *ἢ μή* Mark xii. 14 ; cf. Bos, *Ellips.* p. 759 ; Klotz, *Devar.* 576 sq. Sometimes, moreover, *ἤ* is used in an interrogative sentence which refers to a preceding categorical sentence (like the Latin *an*, see Hand, *Tursell.* I. 349) 2 Cor. xi. 7 *εἰ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει . . . ἢ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἐμαντὸν ταπεινῶν ;* or *did I commit an offence ?* Rom. vi. 3 (Dio C. 282, 20) etc. cf. Lehmann, *Lucian.* II. 331 sq.

2. The following are instances of the singular use of *εἰ* in *direct* questions (especially in Luke) : Acts i. 6 *ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· κύριε, εἰ . . . ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν ;* Luke xxii. 49 *εἶπον·* 452 *κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ ;* Matt. xii. 10 ; xix. 3 ; Luke xiii. 23 ; ^{7th ed.} Acts xix. 2 ; xxi. 37 ; xxii. 25 ; Mark viii. 23 (on Matt. xx. 15 see Mey.) ; cf. Sept. Gen. xvii. 17 ; xliii. 6 ; 1 Sam. x. 24 ; 2 Sam. ii. 1 ; xx. 17 ; 1 Kings xiii. 14 ; xxii. 6 ; Jon. iv. 4, 9 ; Joel i. 2 ; Tob. v. 5 ; 2 Macc. vii. 7 ; Ruth i. 19. Perhaps this use originated in an ellipsis : *I should like to know* (Mey. on Matt. xii. 10) ; cf. the indirect inquiry in German, *ob das wahr ist ?* But at the period of which we are treating *εἰ* had attained to all the rights of a direct interrogative (cf. Schneider, *Plat. civ.* I. 417), like the Lat. *an* which later writers also use in direct question ; and it would be affectation to insist on taking *εἰ* as equivalent to the indirect *an* (Fr. Mt. p. 425 ; Mr. p. 327). The *si* by which this 532 *εἰ* is rendered in the Vulgate has become in the same way a direct, from an indirect (Liv. 39, 50), interrogative particle. That even in Greek authors *εἰ* is sometimes used in *direct* questions (Hoogev. doetr. partic. I. 327) was asserted again by Stallb. *Phileb.* p. 117, but denied correctly in regard to Attic prose by Bornem. *Xen. Apol.* p. 39 sq., and Stallb. recalled his statement, *Plat. Alcib.* I. 231 ; cf., further, *Herm. Lucian. conser. hist.* p. 221 ; Fr. Mr. p. 328, and Klotz, *Devar.* 511. In the passage, *Odyss.* 1, 158, ad- 475 duced by Zeune, *Vig.* p. 506, *εἰ* was long ago corrected into *ἤ* ; in ^{7th ed.} Plato *rep.* 5, 478 d. all good Codd. have *ἐντός* for *εἰ*, and in *Aristoph. nub.* 483 (*Palaiet, observatt.* p. 60) *εἰ* does not mean *num*, but *an* in an indirect question. So also in *Demosth. Callicl.* p. 735 b. On the other hand, *Dio Chr.* 30, 299 *εἰ τι ἄλλο ὑμῖν προσέταξεν, ἐπέστειλεν ἢ διελέχθη ;* where follows the answer : *πολλὰ καὶ δαιμόνια* — is probably corrupted (*Reiske* proposes *ἢ τι ἄλλο*),

or it is to be taken as an indirect question: *but if he gave you any other injunction?* (may be asked, some one will perhaps ask). Schneider, even in Plat. civ. 4, 440 e., retains on manuscript authority *εἰ*, which recent editors had changed into (*ἀλλ'*) *ἦ*; but he explains this use of the particle in (only apparently) a direct question by an ellipsis, and has expunged the mark of interrogation. (Some have wanted to take *ὅτι* also as a direct interrogative in the N. T., but without sufficient reason, see § 53, 10, 5 p. 456 sq.).

The interrogative *ἄρα* is originally *ἄρα* strengthened, and in an interrogative sentence, distinguished as such by the voice, denotes the conclusion from something preceding, whether a negative answer is expected (where *ἄρα* is equivalent to *num igitur*), or an affirmative (*ergone*) Klotz, Devar. 180 sqq.¹ The former is the more usual in prose (Hm. Vig. 823). and occurs in the N. T. Luke xviii. 8 *ἄρα εὐρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*; *will he then find faith on the earth?* and *ἄραγε* Acts viii. 30, cf. Xen. Mem. 3, 8, 3 *ἄραγε, ἔφη, ἐρωτᾷς με, εἰ τι οἶδα πυρετοῦ ἀγαθόν; οὐκ ἔγωγ', ἔφη*. On the other hand, in Gal. ii. 17 *ἄρα* might be rendered by *ergone*: is Christ therefore a minister of sin? (cf. Schaef. Melet. p. 89; Stallb. Plat. rep. 453 II. 223; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 415). Others read *ἄρα* without a question; ^{7th ed.} this is opposed, however, by the fact that Paul invariably makes a question precede *μὴ γένοιτο*, see Mey. in loc.

To the interrogative particles, *πῶς*, *πότε*, *ποῦ*, etc., which are appropriated 533 to direct questions, correspond, as is well known, in indirect questions (and discourse) the relative forms *ὅπως*, *ὅποτε*, *ὅπου*, etc. (Bttm. II. 277). Even Attic authors, however, do not always observe the distinction (see Kühner II. 583; Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 80; Poppo, ind. ad Xenoph. Cyrop. under *πῶς* and *ποῦ*), and later writers neglect it frequently. In the N. T. the interrogative forms are predominant even in indirect discourse (*πότεν* Jno. vii. 27, *ποῦ* Matt. viii. 20; Jno. iii. 8; on *πῶς* see Wahl, Clav. 439). *Ὅπου* in the N. T. is employed rather as a strict relative.

3. In negative interrogative sentences,

a. *οὐ* where an affirmative answer is expected (Hartung, Partik. 476 II. 83) is commonly equivalent to *nonne*, as in Matt. vii. 22 *οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι προφητεύσαμεν*; *have we not?* etc. xiii. 27; Luke xii. 6; xvii. 17; Jas. ii. 5; Heb. iii. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xiv. 23. Sometimes, when the speaker himself assumes a negative answer, *οὐ* is used with an expression of indignation and reproach, Acts xiii. 10 *οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφω τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας*; *wilt thou not cease* etc.? The tone employed indicates, as with us, the par-

¹ A different view is taken by *Leidenroth*, de vera vocum origine ac vi per linguar. comparationem investiganda (Lips. 1830. 8vo.) p. 59 sqq. Further, see on *ἄρα* and *ἄρα* *Sheppard* in the *Classical Museum*, no. 18.

ticular cast of the question: *WILT thou not cease?* (i.e. thou wilt cease wilt thou not?) is *nonne desines?* but, *wilt thou not CEASE?* (i.e. wilt thou persist?) is *non desines?* The *οὐ* here negatives the verb (*non desinere* i. q. *pergere*), see Franke I. 15. Cf. Plut. Lucull. c. 40 *οὐ παύσῃ σὺ πλουτῶν μὲν ὡς Κράσσος, ζῶν δ' ὡς Δούκουλλος, λέγων δὲ ὡς Κάτωι*; So also Luke xvii. 18; Mark xiv. 60. — *Οὐκ ἄρα* in Acts xxi. 38 means *non igitur, art thou not therefore* (as I supposed, but as I now see denied) etc. Klotz, Devar. 186, (*nonne*, as the Vulgate renders it, would rather be, in connection with *nevertheless*, *ἀρ' οὐ* or *οὐκουν*, see Hm. Vig. 795, 824).

b. *Μή* (*μήτι*) is used, when a negative answer is presumed or expected (Franke as above, 18).¹ Jno. vii. 31 *μή πλείονα σημεῖα ποιήσει*; surely he will not do more signs will he? (that is not conceivable), xxi. 5; Rom. iii. 5 (Philippi is incorrect), ix. 20; xi. 1; Matt. vii. 16; Mark iv. 21; Acts x. 47, etc. Both interrogatives are (in accordance with the above distinction) used consecutively in Luke vi. 39 *μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφοτέροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται*; The assertion of Hm. (Vig. 789), that *μή* sometimes anticipates an affirmative answer, has been contested by Franke l. c. and others; some interpreters, however, have wanted to take it so sometimes in the N. T. (Lücke, Joh. I. 602; cf. Fr. Mtth. p. 432). But the speaker always has his eye on a negative answer, and would not be surprised if he received such: Jno. iv. 33 has any one brought him anything to eat? (I can't believe it, especially here in the country of the Samaritans!), viii. 22: will he kill himself? (yet we cannot believe that of him), cf. Matt. xii. 23; Jno. iv. 29; vii. 26, 35. Occasionally there exists an inclination to believe what is asked; but inasmuch as the question is put negatively, the speaker assumes the appearance, at least, of wishing a negative reply. Some have taken *μή* in the sense of *nonne* likewise in Jas. iii. 14 *εἰ ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε . . . μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας* — but incorrectly. The sentence is categorical: *do not boast* (of your Christian knowledge, vs. 13) *against the truth*. When *μή* *οὐ* occurs in a question, *οὐ* belongs to the verb of the sentence, and *μή* alone is interrogatory, as in Rom. x. 18 *μή οὐκ ἤκουσαν*; *did they fail to hear?* (i.e. it can't be that they did not hear, can it?) vs. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5; xi. 22 (Judg. vi. 13; xiv. 3; Jer. viii. 4; Xen. Mem. 4, 2, 12; Plat. Meno p. 89 c. and Lysias 213 d.; Acta Apocr. p. 79). On the other hand, *οὐ μή* is merely a strengthened

¹ As to the Latin *num*, see *Hand*, Tursell. p. 320.

form of a simple negation which may stand either interrogatively or not: Jno. xviii. 11 οὐ μὴ πῖω αὐτό; *shall I not drink it?* Arrian. Epictet. 3, 22, 33, see § 56, 3, 505 sq.

Acts vii. 42 μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηγάκατέ μοι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; (from Amos): *did ye offer to me ... in the wilderness?* (ye did not, did ye?); the narrative then proceeds with καὶ ἀνέλαβετε, because the question implies: *ye brought me no offerings for forty years and ye (even) took up etc.* A different view is given by Fr. Mr. p. 66. On the other hand, see Mey. The passage in Amos has not yet been itself duly explained. Perhaps the prophet follows a different tradition from that contained in the Pentateuch. As to Luke xviii. 7 see above, p. 494.

In Matt. vii. 9 τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; two questions are blended: *who is there among you that ... would give?* and, *would one if asked for ... give ...* (surely he would not give, would he)? Cf. Luke xi. 11 and Bornem. in loc.

Note. As to Jno. xviii. 37 see, in particular, Hm. Vig. 794. Οἴκουν is *non* (*nonne*) *ergo* with or without a question, οἴκοῦν *ergo* (the negation being dropped). Now if we read the above passage interrogatively οἴκουν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ; it will mean, *art thou then not a king? nonne ergo* (Hm. Vig. 795) *rex es?* and the speaker thinks of an affirmative answer (after the words of Jesus ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ etc.), see no. 3. But οἴκοῦν (as editors have it) βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ is simpler: *thou art a king then, ergo* 535 *rex es* (perhaps with a touch of irony, see Bremi, Demosth. p. 238) with or without a question (Xen. Cyr. 2, 4, 15; 5, 2, 26. 29; Aristot. rhet. 3, 18, 14, etc.). Οἴκοῦν gets the meaning of *therefore, then, accordingly* because originally οἴκοῦν also was regarded as interrogative, *thou art a king then?* (is it not so? is that not true?), see Hm. Vig. p. 794 sq.; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 432 sq.¹ A question appears to me more suitable to the speaker as a magistrate, and Lülcke has expressed the same opinion. At all events, οἴκοῦν cannot signify *non igitur*, as Kühnöl and Bretschneider maintain; in that case it would require to be written separately οὐκ οἶν.

455 B. STRUCTURE OF PROPOSITIONS AND THEIR COMBINATION 6th ed. INTO PERIODS.

478

7th ed. § 58. THE PROPOSITION AND ITS COMPONENT PARTS, IN GENERAL.

1. The necessary parts of a simple sentence are Subject, Predicate, and Copula. As, however, the Subject and the Predicate may be supplemented and enlarged in a variety of ways by means

¹ Rost 742 and Gayl. p. 149 are opposed to distinguishing the words by means of accentuation.

of adjuncts; so again the Predicate is frequently, and the Subject sometimes, blended with the Copula. The limits of the Copula are never doubtful; but it may sometimes be uncertain which and how many words constitute the Subject or the Predicate, as in Rom. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 17; xi. 13; xiii. 7. In this event we encounter not a grammatical but a hermeneutical inquiry.

The Infinitive (by itself), when it stands for the Imperative (Phil. iii. 16), see § 43, 5 p. 316, is not a complete sentence, because every grammatical indication of the subject is wanting, which in other moods is given by the person of the verb.

2. The Subject and the Predicate are regularly nouns (including Infinitives used as substantives, Phil. i. 22, 29; 1 Thess. iv. 3); but sometimes whole clauses take their place: Luke xxii. 37 τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη, 1 Thess. iv. 1 παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν, Matt. xv. 26 οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων etc. The case of the Subject (in independent sentences) is, as everybody knows, the Nominative, (in dependent the Accusative, Acc. with Inf.); yet the Partitive Genitive also may elliptically stand as the Subject, Acts xxi. 16 see § 30, 8, note 2. On the other hand, the alleged use of ἐν as nota nominativi, in imitation of the Hebrew *ʔessentiae*, does not merit a moment's consideration, and the latter itself is a grammatical figment; see § 29, note, p. 184.

Deserving of distinct mention is the Predicate which consists of a Participle with the Article, as in Matt. x. 20 οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ οἱ λαλοῦντες, Jno. v. 32; xiv. 28; Phil. ii. 13; Rom. viii. 33; Gal. i. 7, etc.; this is to be carefully distinguished from the participle without the article, cf. Mtth. 717; Fr. Rom. II. 212 sq.

3. The Copula, as is well known, regularly agrees with the Subject in number, the Predicate in number and gender; except that when the Predicate consists of a substantive it may differ in gender and number from the Subject, e.g. 2 Cor. i. 14 καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμέν, 1 Thess. ii. 20 ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά, Jno. 479 xi. 25 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή, viii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Rom. vii. 13; Eph. i. 23 ἡτις (ἡ ἐκκλησία) ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (see § 24, 3); 1 Cor. xi. 7; Col. iv. 11; Luke xxii. 20.¹ Yet deviations from the preceding rule occur, even in prose, when the writer pays more regard to the *meaning* of the subject than to its grammatical

¹ Instances in which the Neuter has a depreciatory force, as in 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτά τινες ἦτε, grammatically considered, come likewise under this head.

form. This takes place more frequently in Greek than in Latin. Consequently

a. A Singular Predicate (Copula) is joined to a Neuter Plural, mostly when the Subject is *lifeless*, and may be regarded as a mass (Bhdy. 418; Mtth. 761); as, Jno. x. 25 τὰ ἔργα . . . μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ, 2 Pet. ii. 20 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων, Acts i. 18; xxvi. 24; Jno. ix. 3; x. 21; iii. 23; xix. 31; Rev. viii. 3. But

a) when prominence is to be given to the plurality and diversity of the objects (Weber, Demosth. p. 529), the Pred. is put in the Plural, as Jno. xix. 31 ἵνα κατεργῶσιν αὐτῶν (of the three persons crucified) τὰ σκέλη (previously ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ τὰ σώματα is used, cf. also vi. 13; Rev. xxi. 12; xx. 7; Xen. An. 1, 7, 17); seldom otherwise, 1 Tim. v. 25 τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα (ἔργα) κρυβῆναι οὐ δύνανται, Rom. i. 19 ἃ εἶδες καὶ ἃ εἰσίν (but immediately afterwards ἃ μέλλει γίνεσθαι), Luke xxiv. 11 (not Rom. iii. 2, see § 39, 1 a.). In 2 Pet. iii. 10 Sing. and Plur. are united. Likewise 537 in Greek authors (Rost 475; Kühner II. 50) the Plural of the verb is not unfrequently used, especially when instead of the Neut. another substantive, Masculine or Feminine, may be in the mind (Hm. Soph. Elect. p. 67; Poppo, Thucyd. I. I. 97 f. and Cyrop. p. 116; yet see Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 93); yet in other cases also, cf. Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 2; Anab. 1, 4, 4; Hipparch. 8, 10; Thuc. 6, 62; Ael. anim. 11, 37; Plat. rep. 1, 353 c.

β) neuters, however, which denote or refer to *animate* objects, especially persons, are almost always construed with a Plural Pred.; as, Matt. x. 21 ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς, Jas. ii. 19 τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν, Jno. x. 8 οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα, Mark iii. 11; v. 13; vii. 28; Matt. vi. 26; xii. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 17; Rev. iii. 2, 4; xi. 13, 18; xvi. 14; xix. 21 (Matt. xxvii. 52 πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν, Rev. xi. 13). In other passages the Codd. vary remarkably, and there is a preponderance of authority for the Sing. in Mark iv. 4; Luke iv. 41; viii. 38; xiii. 19; Jno. x. 12; 1 Jno. iv. 1; Rev. xviii. 3; indeed, in Luke viii. 2 is found without var. ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἐπ' τὰ ἐξεληλύθει, vs. 30 εἰσηλθεν δαιμόνιον πολλά, and in 1 Jno. iii. 10 φανερά ἐστιν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τ. τοῦ διαβόλου. Cf. also Eph. iv. 17 and Rom. ix. 8. The Sing. and Plur. are connected in Jno. x. 4 τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι 480 οἶδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, 27 τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι, Rev. xvi. 14; cf. 1 Sam. ix. 12. Lastly

in Rev. xvii. 12 τὰ δέκα κέρατα δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσὶν the Plur. of the verb is more appropriate, on account of the Predicate noun, cf. 1 Cor. x. 11. The use of the Plural Pred. with animate Subjects is the rule in Greek authors also, cf. Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9 τὰ ζῶα ἐπίστανται, Plat. Lach. 180 e. τὰ μαιράκια ἐπιμέμνηνται, Thuc. 1, 58; 4, 88; 7, 57; Eur. Bacch. 677 f.; Arrian. Alex. 3, 28, 11; 5, 17, 12; see Hm. Vig. 739.

In general, the construction of Neuters with Plural verbs is more frequent in Greek prose authors than is usually supposed (though the Codd. vary noticeably), Reitz, Lucian. VII. 483 Bip.; Ast, Plat. legg. 6th ed. p. 46; Zell, Aristot. Ethic. Nicom. p. 4 and 209; Bremi, exc. 10 ad Lys. p. 448 sq.; Held, Plutarch. Aem. Paull. p. 280; Ellendt, praef. ad Arrian. I. 21 sq.; Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. p. 173, but chiefly in later writers, and that without any distinction (Agath. 4, 5; 9, 15; 26, 9; 28, 1; 32, 6; 39, 10; 42, 6, etc.; Thilo, Apocr. I. 182; Boisson. Psell. p. 257 sq.; Dresser, ind. to Epiphan. monach. p. 136). The proposal of Jacobs (Athen. p. 228, cf. also Heind. Cratyl. p. 137) to substitute the Singular in all such passages was apparently retracted subsequently by that scholar himself (cf. Jacobs, Philostr. imag. p. 236), though where Codd. offer the Singular 538 we may, with Boisson. Eunap. p. 420, 601, give it the preference.

What was said of the Singular of the Pred. after Neuters applies only to the form of the verb; if the Predicate consists of εἶναι or γίνεσθαι with an adjective, the latter is put in the Plur. while the verb is Sing., as in Gal. v. 19 φανερά ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, 1 Cor. xiv. 25 τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερά γίνεται.

4. b. *Collectives* denoting *animate* objects are construed with a Plural Pred.: Matt. xxi. 8 ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια (Mark ix. 15; Luke vi. 19; xxiii. 1), 1 Cor. xvi. 15 οἴδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ, ὅτι . . . εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς, Rev. xviii. 4 ἐξέλθετε ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὁ λαὸς μου (Hesiod. scut. 827), also ix. 18 ἀπεκτάνθησαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, viii. 9 (but Sing. viii. 8 f., 11); Luke viii. 37; Acts xxv. 24. Elsewhere the Plur. and the Sing. of the verb or Pred. occur in connection, as in Jno. vi. 2 ἡ κολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς, ὅτι ἐώρων (xii. 9 f., 12 f., 18), Luke i. 21 ἦν ὁ λαὸς προσδοκῶν καὶ ἐθαύμαζον, Acts xv. 12 (1 Cor. xvi. 15). The Plural, in reference to a Collective, occurs in Luke ix. 12 ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες . . . καταλύσωσι etc. When the Pred. consists of an adjective with εἶναι, the adjective is of course not only Plur. but also in the gender of the persons, as in Jno. vii. 49 ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος . . . ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν. On the other hand, attributives in such constructions may stand either in the Plur. or the Sing.;—in the Sing. when they precede

frequently, with the Subjunct. Aorist, sometimes with the Subjunct. Present (Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 51, see below), and sometimes also with the Indic. Fut. (Bengel on Matt. v. 18 is mistaken), see Ast, Plat. polit. p. 365; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 36 sq.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 409 sqq.; Gayl. p. 430 sqq. The difference between the Subj. Aor. and the Fut. Indic. (which alone occur in the N. T.) is defined by Hm. Soph. Oed. Col. ver. 853 thus: *Conjunctivo Aor.* locus est aut in eo, quod jam actum est (see, however, Ellendt as above, p. 411 sq.), aut in re incerti temporis, sed semel vel brevi
 472 temporis momento agenda; *Futuri* vero usus, quem ipsa verbi
 1th ed. forma nonnisi in rebus futuris versari ostendit, ad ea pertinet, quae aut diuturniora aliquando eventura indicare volumus aut non aliquo quocunque, sed remotiore aliquo tempore dicimus futura esse. The inquiry whether this distinction is observed in the N. T., is rendered difficult by the variations of MSS., of which, in many passages, some have the Indic. Fut., and some the Aor. Subj. So far as can be ascertained by the present apparatus of various readings, the Subj. is established in Matt. v. 18, 20, 26; x. 23; xviii. 3; xxiii. 39; Mark xiii. 2, 19, 30; Luke vi. 37; xii. 59; xiii. 35; xviii. 17, 30; xxi. 18; Jno. viii. 51; x. 28; xi. 26, 56; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. viii. 13; 2 Pet. i. 10; Rev. ii. 11; iii. 3, 12; xviii. 7, 21 f.; xxi. 25, 27. There is a preponderance of evidence for the Subj. in Matt. xvi. 28; xxvi. 35; Mark ix. 41; xvi. 18; Luke i. 15; ix. 27; xviii. 7, 30; xxii. 68; Jno. vi. 35;
 529 viii. 12, 52; xiii. 8; Rom. iv. 8; Gal. v. 16; 1 Thess. v. 3. There is at least as much evidence for the Subj. as for the Fut. in Mark xiv. 31; Luke xxi. 33; Matt. xv. 5; xxiv. 35; Gal. iv. 30; Heb. x. 17; Rev. ix. 6 (xviii. 14).¹ The authorities decidedly favor

is to be considered as elliptical: *οὐ μὴ φοβῆσθαι* for *οὐ δέδουκα* or *οὐ φόβος*, *οὐ θεός ἐστὶ* (there is no fear) *μὴ π.* see Ast, Plat. polit. p. 365; *Mutthiae*, Eurip. Hippol. p. 24; Sprachl. II. 1174; Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 1028; *Hartung* II. 156. This involves, indeed, the assumption that the Greeks lost sight of the origin of the expression; for in many passages "there is no fear that" is not appropriate, (in the N. T. Matt. v. 20; xviii. 3; Luke xxii. 16; Jno. iv. 48). Earlier Hm. (Eurip. Med. p. 390 sq.) had explained the phrase differently, cf. also Gayl. p. 402. The connective *οὐδὲ μὴ* (καὶ οὐ μὴ) occurs in the N. T. only in Rev. vii. 16 (var.), but frequently in the Sept. e.g. Exod. xxii. 21; xxiii. 13; Josh. xxiii. 7; and *οὐδέτις μὴ* in Wisd. i. 8. Generally, *οὐ μὴ* is of very frequent occurrence in the Sept., and its prevalence may probably be referred to that effort after expressiveness, characteristic of the later language. The instances have been collected by Gayl. p. 441 sqq. It is not the fact, however, that in the N. T. (*Hüzig*, Joh. Marc. S. 106) Mark and the Revelation display a predilection for *οὐ μὴ*. A concordance will prove the contrary.

¹ It must not be overlooked that sometimes the Future form may be occasioned in MSS. by a preceding or following Future, as in Jno. viii. 12 *οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃς . . . ἀλλ' ἔτι.*

the Fut. in Luke x. 19; xxii. 34; Jno. iv. 14; x. 5. The Fut. is 450 established (without var.) in Matt. xvi. 22 οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο ^{6th ed.} (absit) ne tibi accidat hoc. Accordingly the Subj. is indisputably predominant in the N. T. (cf. Lob. Phryn. p. 722 sq.), and this is no less the case in Greek authors, see Hartung, Partik. II. 156 f. Hermann's rule on the whole does not apply to the N. T.; for although several passages might be interpreted in accordance with it, yet others in turn are at variance with it, and the Aor. is employed where the Fut. should have been used, as e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 15 ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας, where the point of time is very definitely in mind viz. *on the day of Christ's second coming*; and Heb. viii. 11, where in οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν there is reference to a precise time (the Messianic period, vs. 10), and duration also is indicated, cf. Rev. xxi. 25. In fact, the Subj. Aor. in the sense of the Future had become usual in later Greek, cf. Lob. as above, p. 723; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 57. Mdv. also S. 127 discovers no perceptible difference between the Fut. and the Aor. in this construction. (Gayl. 440 sqq. has catalogued all the passages in the Sept. where οὐ μὴ occurs.)

The statement of Dawes, however, which recognizes no difference of meaning between the Aor. and Fut. in this construction, but as respects the former allows only the 2d Aor. Act. (and Mid.) in Greek texts, has been almost universally rejected (see Mth. II. 1175 f.; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 343; on the other hand, Bhdy. 402 f.), and cannot be applied to the N. T., where the 1st Aor. is as frequent as the 2d Aor. even in verbs 473 that have a 2d Aor. in common use, (var. see Rev. xviii. 14). ^{7th ed.}

Sometimes οὐ μὴ is followed, according to a few Codd., by a *Present* Indic., viz. in Jno. iv. 48 ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδῃτε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύετε, and Heb. xiii. 5 Sept. οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλείπω; indeed, one Cod. (quoted by Griesb.) has in Rev. iii. 12 the Optative, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθοι. The last is undoubtedly only a mistake of a transcriber, misled by the ear (the case is different in the orat. obliq. in Soph. Philoct. 611, Schaef. in loc.; cf. also the same on Demosth. II. 321), and the Subjunctive was long ago restored. Likewise in Heb. as above, ἐγκαταλίπω is undoubtedly the true reading. But in Jno. iv. 48 perhaps the reading ought to be πιστεύῃτε, as the Subj. 530 *Present* is so used in Greek authors also, as in Soph. Oed. Col. 1024 οὐ, οὐ μὴ ποτε χώρας φυγόντες τῆςδ' ἐπεύχωνται θεοῖς (according to Hm. and others), Xen. C. 8, 1, 5; An. 2, 2, 12 (see Hm. Eurip. Med. Elmsl. p. 390; Stallb. Plat. polit. p. 51; Ast, Plat. pol. p. 365), and, as in the passage from John, after a conditional clause with ἐὰν in Xen. Hier. 11, 15 ἐὰν τοὺς φίλους κρατῇς εὖ ποιῶν, οὐ μὴ σοι δύνωνται ἀντίχειν οἱ πολέμοι, and

frequently in Demosth. (Gayl. p. 437). In John, however, there is preponderant MS. authority [to which Sin. must be added] for πιστεύετε, which Lchm. and Tdf. have adopted. What Hm. Iphig. Taur. p. 102 says of an Indic. Pres. after οὐ μή, the received text would hardly substantiate. As to Luke xviii. 7 see § 57, 3 and p. 494.

This intensive οὐ μή is used also in dependent clauses: not merely in relative clauses Matt. xvi. 28; Luke xviii. 30; Acts xiii. 41, but also in 451 objective clauses with ὅτι Luke xiii. 35; xxii. 16; Matt. xxiv. 34; Jno. 6th ed. xi. 56 τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἐσπέρην; *what think ye? that he will not come to the feast?* Likewise in direct question with τίς, Rev. xv. 4 τίς οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇ; Cf. with the former passages, Xen. C. 8, 1, 5 τοῦτο γὰρ εἰ εἰδέναι χρή, ὅτι οὐ μὴ δύνηται Κῦρος εἰπεῖν etc. Thuc. 5, 69; and with the latter, Neh. ii. 3 δὰ τί οὐ μὴ γένηται πονηρόν etc. On οὐ μὴ in an interrogative clause, without an interrogative pronoun, construed with a Subjunctive or a Future (Ruth iii. 1), see § 57, 3, p. 511 sq.

Note. *Not ... , no one ... , nothing ... except*, is commonly expressed by οὐ ..., οὐδείς ..., οὐδέν ... εἰ μὴ, as in Matt. xi. 27; xxi. 19; Luke iv. 26; Jno. xvii. 12, etc. (Klotz, Devar. p. 524). More rarely the negation is followed by πλὴν, as in Acts xx. 23; xxvii. 22; ἧ is found only in Jno. xiii. 10 text. rec.: ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρεῖαν ἢ τοὺς πόδας νύσασθαι. Most Codd. have εἰ μὴ, and this Lchm. has adopted. The latter, however, may be a correction of the rarer ἧ, which yet occasionally occurs, Xen. C. 7, 5, 41.

§ 57. INTERROGATIVE PARTICLES.

1. In the N. T., interrogative sentences (cf. Krü. 250 f.) which commence neither with an interrogative pronoun, nor with a special interrogative adverb (πῶς, ποῦ etc.),

474 a. if *direct*, have usually no interrogative particle (Jno. vii. 23; 7th ed. xiii. 6; xix. 10; Acts xxi. 37; Luke xiii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 2; Rom. 531 ii. 21; Gal. iii. 21, etc.).¹ Sometimes, however, contrary to the usage of the written language of the Greeks, εἰ is employed before a question in which the inquirer merely discloses his uncertainty, without intimating that he expects a reply (see no. 2).

b. if *indirect*, they are introduced by εἰ (which is here, too, the conditional conjunction).²

¹ Hence it is sometimes matter of dispute among commentators whether a particular sentence is to be taken as interrogative or not, e.g. Jno. xvi. 31; Rom. viii. 33; xiv. 22; 1 Cor. i. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 1; xii. 19; Heb. x. 2; Jas. ii. 4; or how many words are comprehended in an interrogation, e.g. Jno. vii. 19; Rom. iv. 1. On this, Grammar can ordinarily give no decision.

² How εἰ acquires the general force of an interrogative particle, see Hartung, Partik. II. 201 ff.; cf. Klotz, Devar. 508.

In direct double questions *πότερον* . . . *ἤ* is used only once, Jno. vii. 17 ; elsewhere the first question is without an interrogative particle, Luke xx. 4 ; Gal. i. 10 ; iii. 2 ; Rom. ii. 3, etc., and only the second has *ἤ*, — if negative, *ἢ οὐ* Matt. xxii. 17 ; Luke xx. 22, or *ἢ μή* Mark xii. 14 ; cf. Bos, *Ellips.* p. 759 ; Klotz, *Devar.* 576 sq. Sometimes, moreover, *ἤ* is used in an interrogative sentence which refers to a preceding categorical sentence (like the Latin *an*, see Hand, *Tursell.* I. 349) 2 Cor. xi. 7 *εἰ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει . . . ἢ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἑμαντὸν ταπεινῶν ;* or *did I commit an offence ?* Rom. vi. 3 (Dio C. 282, 20) etc. cf. Lehmann, *Lucian.* II. 331 sq.

2. The following are instances of the singular use of *εἰ* in *direct* questions (especially in Luke) : Acts i. 6 *ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· κύριε, εἰ . . . ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν ;* Luke xxii. 49 *εἶπον·* 452 *κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ ;* Matt. xii. 10 ; xix. 3 ; Luke xiii. 23 ; 6th ed. Acts xix. 2 ; xxi. 37 ; xxii. 25 ; Mark viii. 23 (on Matt. xx. 15 see Mey.) ; cf. Sept. Gen. xvii. 17 ; xliii. 6 ; 1 Sam. x. 24 ; 2 Sam. ii. 1 ; xx. 17 ; 1 Kings xiii. 14 ; xxii. 6 ; Jon. iv. 4, 9 ; Joel i. 2 ; Tob. v. 5 ; 2 Macc. vii. 7 ; Ruth i. 19. Perhaps this use originated in an ellipsis : *I should like to know* (Mey. on Matt. xii. 10) ; cf. the indirect inquiry in German, *ob das wahr ist ?* But at the period of which we are treating *εἰ* had attained to all the rights of a direct interrogative (cf. Schneider, *Plat. civ.* I. 417), like the Lat. *an* which later writers also use in direct question ; and it would be affectation to insist on taking *εἰ* as equivalent to the indirect *an* (Fr. Mt. p. 425 ; Mr. p. 327). The *si* by which this 532 *εἰ* is rendered in the Vulgate has become in the same way a direct, from an indirect (Liv. 39, 50),*interrogative particle. That even in Greek authors *εἰ* is sometimes used in *direct* questions (Hoogēv. doct. partic. I. 327) was asserted again by Stallb. *Phileb.* p. 117, but denied correctly in regard to Attic prose by Bornem. Xen. *Apol.* p. 39 sq., and Stallb. recalled his statement, *Plat. Alcib.* I. 231 ; cf., further, Herm. *Lucian. conscr. hist.* p. 221 ; Fr. Mr. p. 328, and Klotz, *Devar.* 511. In the passage, *Odyss.* 1, 158, ad- 475 duced by Zeune, Vig. p. 506, *εἰ* was long ago corrected into *ἤ* ; in 7th ed. Plato *rep.* 5, 478 d. all good Codd. have *ἐντός* for *εἰ*, and in Aristoph. *nub.* 483 (Palaiet, *observatt.* p. 60) *εἰ* does not mean *num*, but *an* in an indirect question. So also in Demosth. *Callicl.* p. 735 b. On the other hand, Dio Chr. 30, 299 *εἰ τι ἄλλο ὑμῖν προσέταξεν, ἐπέστειλεν ἢ διελέχθη ;* where follows the answer : *πολλὰ καὶ δαιμόνια* — is probably corrupted (Reiske proposes *ἢ τι ἄλλο*),

or it is to be taken as an indirect question: *but if he gave you any other injunction?* (may be asked, some one will perhaps ask). Schneider, even in Plat. civ. 4, 440 e., retains on manuscript authority *εἰ*, which recent editors had changed into (*ἀλλ'*) *ἦ*; but he explains this use of the particle in (only apparently) a direct question by an ellipsis, and has expunged the mark of interrogation. (Some have wanted to take *ὅτι* also as a direct interrogative in the N. T., but without sufficient reason, see § 53, 10, 5 p. 456 sq.).

The interrogative *ἄρα* is originally *ἄρα* strengthened, and in an interrogative sentence, distinguished as such by the voice, denotes the conclusion from something preceding, whether a negative answer is expected (where *ἄρα* is equivalent to *num igitur*), or an affirmative (*ergone*) Klotz, Devar. 180 sqq.¹ The former is the more usual in prose (Hm. Vig. 823), and occurs in the N. T. Luke xviii. 8 *ἄρα εὐρήσεται τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*; *will he then find faith on the earth?* and *ἄραγε* Acts viii. 30, cf. Xen. Mem. 3, 8, 3 *ἄραγε, ἔφη, ἐρωτᾷς με, εἰ τι οἶδα πυρετοῦ ἀγαθόν; οὐκ ἔγωγ', ἔφη*. On the other hand, in Gal. ii. 17 *ἄρα* might be rendered by *ergone*: is Christ therefore a minister of sin? (cf. Schaef. Melet. p. 89; Stallb. Plat. rep. 453 II. 223; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 415). Others read *ἄρα* without a question; ^{4th ed.} this is opposed, however, by the fact that Paul invariably makes a question precede *μὴ γένοιτο*, see Mey. in loc.

To the interrogative particles, *πῶς*, *πότε*, *ποῦ*, etc., which are appropriated 533 to direct questions, correspond, as is well known, in indirect questions (and discourse) the relative forms *ὅπως*, *ὅποτε*, *ὅπου*, etc. (Bttm. II. 277). Even Attic authors, however, do not always observe the distinction (see Kühner II. 583; Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 80; Poppo, ind. ad Xenoph. Cyrop. under *πῶς* and *ποῦ*), and later writers neglect it frequently. In the N. T. the interrogative forms are predominant even in indirect discourse (*πόθεν* Jno. vii. 27, *ποῦ* Matt. viii. 20; Jno. iii. 8; on *πῶς* see Wahl, Clav. 439). *Ὅπου* in the N. T. is employed rather as a strict relative.

3. In *negative* interrogative sentences,

a. *οὐ* where an affirmative answer is expected (Hartung, Partik. 476 II. 83) is commonly equivalent to *nonne*, as in Matt. vii. 22 *οὐ τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι προεφητεύσαμεν*; *have we not?* etc. xiii. 27; Luke xii. 6; xvii. 17; Jas. ii. 5; Heb. iii. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xiv. 23. Sometimes, when the speaker himself assumes a negative answer, *οὐ* is used with an expression of indignation and reproach, Acts xiii. 10 *οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας*; *wilt thou not cease* etc.? The tone employed indicates, as with us, the par-

¹ A different view is taken by *Leidenroth*, de vera vocum origine ac vi per linguar. comparationem investiganda (Lips. 1830. 8vo.) p. 59 sqq. Further, see on *ἄρα* and *ἄρα* *Sheppard* in the *Classical Museum*, no. 18.

ticular cast of the question: *WILT thou not cease?* (i.e. thou wilt cease wilt thou not?) is *nonne desines?* but, *wilt thou not CEASE?* (i.e. wilt thou persist?) is *non desines?* The *οὐ* here negatives the verb (non desinere i. q. pergere), see Franke I. 15. Cf. Plut. Lucull. c. 40 *οὐ παύσῃ σὺ πλουτῶν μὲν ὡς Κράσσος, ζῶν δ' ὡς Δούκουλος, λέγων δὲ ὡς Κάτων;* So also Luke xvii. 18; Mark xiv. 60. — *Οὐκ ἄρα* in Acts xxi. 38 means *non igitur, art thou not therefore* (as I supposed, but as I now see denied) etc. Klotz, Devar. 186, (*nonne*, as the Vulgate renders it, would rather be, in connection with *nevertheless*, *ἀρ' οὐ* or *οὐκουν*, see Hm. Vig. 795, 824).

b. *Μή* (*μήτι*) is used, when a negative answer is presumed or expected (Franke as above, 18).¹ Jno. vii. 31 *μή πλεονα σημεῖα ποιήσῃ;* surely he will not do more signs will he? (that is not conceivable), xxi. 5; Rom. iii. 5 (Philippi is incorrect), ix. 20; xi. 1; Matt. vii. 16; Mark iv. 21; Acts x. 47, etc. Both interrogatives are (in accordance with the above distinction) used consecutively in Luke vi. 39 *μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφοτέροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται;* The assertion of Hm. (Vig. 789), that *μή* sometimes anticipates an affirmative answer, has been contested by Franke l. c. and others; some interpreters, however, have wanted to take it so sometimes in the N. T. (Lücke, Joh. I. 602; cf. Fr. Mtth. p. 432). But the speaker always has his eye on a negative answer, and would not be surprised if he received such: Jno. iv. 33 has any one brought him anything to eat? (I can't believe it, especially here in the country of the Samaritans!), viii. 22: will he kill himself? (yet we cannot believe that of him), cf. Matt. xii. 23; Jno. iv. 29; vii. 26, 35. Occasionally there exists an inclination to believe what is asked; but inasmuch as the question is put negatively, the speaker assumes the appearance, at least, of wishing a negative reply. Some have taken *μή* in the sense of *nonne* likewise in Jas. iii. 14 *εἰ ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε . . . μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας* — but incorrectly. The sentence is categorical: *do not boast* (of your Christian knowledge, vs. 13) *against the truth*. When *μή* *οὐ* occurs in a question, *οὐ* belongs to the verb of the sentence, and *μή* alone is interrogatory, as in Rom. x. 18 *μή οὐκ ἤκουσαν;* *did they fail to hear?* (i.e. it can't be that they did not hear, can it?) vs. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5; xi. 22 (Judg. vi. 13; xiv. 3; Jer. viii. 4; Xen. Mem. 4, 2, 12; Plat. Meno p. 89 c. and Lysias 213 d.; Acta Apocr. p. 79). On the other hand, *οὐ μή* is merely a strengthened

¹ As to the Latin *num*, see *Hand*, Tursell. p. 320.

form of a simple negation which may stand either interrogatively or not: Jno. xviii. 11 οὐ μὴ πῖω αὐτό; *shall I not drink it?* Arrian. Epictet. 3, 22, 33, see § 56, 3, 505 sq.

Acts vii. 42 μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηγάκατέ μοι ἐν τη ἐρήμῳ; (from Amos): *did ye offer to me . . . in the wilderness?* (ye did not, did ye?); the narrative then proceeds with καὶ ἀνελάβετε, because the question implies: *ye brought me no offerings for forty years and ye (even) took up* etc. A different view is given by Fr. Mr. p. 66. On the other hand, see Mey. The passage in Amos has not yet been itself duly explained. Perhaps the prophet follows a different tradition from that contained in the Pentateuch. As to Luke xviii. 7 see above, p. 494.

In Matt. vii. 9 τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, δὴ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; two questions are blended: *who is there among you that . . . would give?* and, *would one if asked for . . . give . . .* (surely he would not give, would he)? Cf. Luke xi. 11 and Bornem. in loc.

Note. As to Jno. xviii. 37 see, in particular, Hm. Vig. 794. Οὐκοῦν is *non (nonne) ergo* with or without a question, οὐκοῦν *ergo* (the negation being dropped). Now if we read the above passage interrogatively οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἰ σύ; it will mean, *art thou then not a king? nonne ergo* (Hm. Vig. 795) *rex es?* and the speaker thinks of an affirmative answer (after the words of Jesus ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ etc.), see no. 3. But οὐκοῦν (as editors have it) βασιλεὺς εἰ σύ is simpler: *thou art a king then, ergo* 535 *rex es* (perhaps with a touch of irony, see Bremi, Demosth. p. 238) with or without a question (Xen. Cyr. 2, 4, 15; 5, 2, 26. 29; Aristot. rhet. 3, 18, 14, etc.). Οὐκοῦν gets the meaning of *therefore, then, accordingly* because originally οὐκοῦν also was regarded as interrogative, *thou art a king then?* (is it not so? is that not true?), see Hm. Vig. p. 794 sq.; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 432 sq.¹ A question appears to me more suitable to the speaker as a magistrate, and Lücke has expressed the same opinion. At all events, οὐκοῦν cannot signify *non igitur*, as Kühnöl and Bretschneider maintain; in that case it would require to be written separately οὐκ οὖν.

455 B. STRUCTURE OF PROPOSITIONS AND THEIR COMBINATION 6th ed. INTO PERIODS.

478

7th ed. § 58. THE PROPOSITION AND ITS COMPONENT PARTS, IN GENERAL.

1. The necessary parts of a simple sentence are Subject, Predicate, and Copula. As, however, the Subject and the Predicate may be supplemented and enlarged in a variety of ways by means

¹ Rost 742 and Gayl. p. 149 are opposed to distinguishing the words by means of accentuation.

of adjuncts; so again the Predicate is frequently, and the Subject sometimes, blended with the Copula. The limits of the Copula are never doubtful; but it may sometimes be uncertain which and how many words constitute the Subject or the Predicate, as in Rom. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 17; xi. 13; xiii. 7. In this event we encounter not a grammatical but a hermeneutical inquiry.

The Infinitive (by itself), when it stands for the Imperative (Phil. iii. 16), see § 43, 5 p. 316, is not a complete sentence, because every grammatical indication of the subject is wanting, which in other moods is given by the person of the verb.

2. The Subject and the Predicate are regularly nouns (including Infinitives used as substantives, Phil. i. 22, 29; 1 Thess. iv. 3); but sometimes whole clauses take their place: Luke xxii. 37 τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη, 1 Thess. iv. 1 παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν, Matt. xv. 26 οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων etc. The case of the Subject (in independent sentences) is, as everybody knows, the Nominative, (in dependent the Accusative, Acc. with Inf.); yet the Partitive Genitive also may elliptically stand as the Subject, Acts xxi. 16 see § 30, 8, note 2. On the other hand, the alleged use of ἐν as nota nominativi, in imitation of the Hebrew *essentiae*, does not merit a moment's consideration, and the latter itself is a grammatical figment; see § 29, note, p. 184.

Deserving of distinct mention is the Predicate which consists of a Participle with the Article, as in Matt. x. 20 οὐ γὰρ ὑμῖς ἐστέ οἱ λαλοῦντες, Jno. v. 32; xiv. 28; Phil. ii. 13; Rom. viii. 33; Gal. i. 7, etc.; this is to be carefully distinguished from the participle without the article, cf. Mith. 717; Fr. Rom. II. 212 sq.

3. The Copula, as is well known, regularly agrees with the Subject in number, the Predicate in number and gender; except that when the Predicate consists of a substantive it may differ in gender and number from the Subject, e.g. 2 Cor. i. 14 καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμέν, 1 Thess. ii. 20 ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά, Jno. xi. 25 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή, viii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Rom. vii. 13; Eph. i. 23 ἡτις (ἡ ἐκκλησία) ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (see § 24, 3); 1 Cor. xi. 7; Col. iv. 11; Luke xxii. 20.¹ Yet deviations from the preceding rule occur, even in prose, when the writer pays more regard to the meaning of the subject than to its grammatical

¹ Instances in which the Neuter has a depreciatory force, as in 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτά τινες ἦτε, grammatically considered, come likewise under this head.

form. This takes place more frequently in Greek than in Latin. Consequently

a. A Singular Predicate (Copula) is joined to a Neuter Plural, mostly when the Subject is *lifeless*, and may be regarded as a mass (Bhdy. 418; Mtth. 761); as, Jno. x. 25 τὰ ἔργα . . . μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ, 2 Pet. ii. 20 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων, Acts i. 18; xxvi. 24; Jno. ix. 3; x. 21; iii. 23; xix. 31; Rev. viii. 3. But

a) when prominence is to be given to the plurality and diversity of the objects (Weber, Demosth. p. 529), the Pred. is put in the Plural, as Jno. xix. 31 ἵνα κατεργῶσιν αὐτῶν (of the three persons crucified) τὰ σκέλη (previously ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ τὰ σώματα is used, cf. also vi. 13; Rev. xxi. 12; xx. 7; Xen. An. 1, 7, 17); seldom otherwise, 1 Tim. v. 25 τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα (ἔργα) κρυβῆναι οὐ δύνανται, Rev. i. 19 ἃ εἶδες καὶ ἃ εἰσὶν (but immediately afterwards ἃ μέλλει γίνεσθαι), Luke xxiv. 11 (not Rom. iii. 2, see § 39, 1 a.). In 2 Pet. iii. 10 Sing. and Plur. are united. Likewise 537 in Greek authors (Rost 475; Kühner II. 50) the Plural of the verb is not unfrequently used, especially when instead of the Neut. another substantive, Masculine or Feminine, may be in the mind (Hm. Soph. Elect. p. 67; Poppo, Thucyd. I. I. 97 f. and Cyrop. p. 116; yet see Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 93); yet in other cases also, cf. Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 2; Anab. 1, 4, 4; Hipparch. 8, 10; Thuc. 6, 62; Ael. anim. 11, 37; Plat. rep. 1, 353 c.

β) neuters, however, which denote or refer to *animate* objects, especially persons, are almost always construed with a Plural Pred.; as, Matt. x. 21 ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς, Jas. ii. 19 τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν, Jno. x. 8 οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα, Mark iii. 11; v. 13; vii. 28; Matt. vi. 26; xii. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 17; Rev. iii. 2, 4; xi. 13, 18; xvi. 14; xix. 21 (Matt. xxvii. 52 πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν, Rev. xi. 13). In other passages the Codd. vary remarkably, and there is a preponderance of authority for the Sing. in Mark iv. 4; Luke iv. 41; viii. 38; xiii. 19; Jno. x. 12; 1 Jno. iv. 1; Rev. xviii. 3; indeed, in Luke viii. 2 is found without var. ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἐπὶ τὰ ἐξεληλύθει, vs. 30 εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ, and in 1 Jno. iii. 10 φανερά ἐστιν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τ. τοῦ διαβόλου. Cf. also Eph. iv. 17 and Rom. ix. 8. The Sing. and Plur. are connected in Jno. x. 4 τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι 480 αἰδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, 27 τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει 481 καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι, Rev. xvi. 14; cf. 1 Sam. ix. 12. Lastly

in Rev. xvii. 12 τὰ δέκα κέρατα δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσὶν the Plur. of the verb is more appropriate, on account of the Predicate noun, cf. 1 Cor. x. 11. The use of the Plural Pred. with animate Subjects is the rule in Greek authors also, cf. Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9 τὰ ζῶα ἐπίστανται, Plat. Lach. 180 e. τὰ μαιράκια ἐπιμένονται, Thuc. 1, 58; 4, 88; 7, 57; Eur. Bacch. 677 f.; Arrian. Alex. 3, 28, 11; 5, 17, 12; see Hm. Vig. 739.

In general, the construction of Neuters with Plural verbs is more frequent in Greek prose authors than is usually supposed (though the Codd. vary noticeably), Reitz, Lucian. VII. 483 Bip.; Ast, Plat. legg. 64 ed. p. 46; Zell, Aristot. Ethic. Nicom. p. 4 and 209; Bremi, exc. 10 ad Lys. p. 448 sq.; Held, Plutarch. Aem. Paull. p. 280; Ellendt, praef. ad Arrian. I. 21 sq.; Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. p. 173, but chiefly in later writers, and that without any distinction (Agath. 4, 5; 9, 15; 26, 9; 28, 1; 32, 6; 39, 10; 42, 6, etc.; Thilo, Apocr. I. 182; Boisson. Psell. p. 257 sq.; Dresser, ind. to Epiphan. monach. p. 136). The proposal of Jacobs (Athen. p. 228, cf. also Heind. Cratyl. p. 137) to substitute the Singular in all such passages was apparently retracted subsequently by that scholar himself (cf. Jacobs, Philostr. imag. p. 236), though where Codd. offer the Singular 538 we may, with Boisson. Eunap. p. 420, 601, give it the preference.

What was said of the Singular of the Pred. after Neuters applies only to the form of the verb; if the Predicate consists of εἶναι or γίνεσθαι with an adjective, the latter is put in the Plur. while the verb is Sing., as in Gal. v. 19 φανερά ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, 1 Cor. xiv. 25 τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερά γίνονται.

4. b. *Collectives* denoting animate objects are construed with a Plural Pred.: Matt. xxi. 8 ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια (Mark ix. 15; Luke vi. 19; xxiii. 1), 1 Cor. xvi. 15 οἶδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανῶ, ὅτι . . . εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς, Rev. xviii. 4 ἐξέλθετε ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὁ λαὸς μου (Hesiod. scut. 327), also ix. 18 ἀπεκτάνθησαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, viii. 9 (but Sing. viii. 8 f., 11); Luke viii. 37; Acts xxv. 24. Elsewhere the Plur. and the Sing. of the verb or Pred. occur in connection, as in Jno. vi. 2 ἡκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς, ὅτι ἐώρων (xii. 9 f., 12 f., 18), Luke i. 21 ἦν ὁ λαὸς προσδοκῶν καὶ ἐθαύμαζον, Acts xv. 12 (1 Cor. xvi. 15). The Plural, in reference to a Collective, occurs in Luke ix. 12 ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες . . . καταλύσωσι etc. When the Pred. consists of an adjective with εἶναι, the adjective is of course not only Plur. but also in the gender of the persons, as in Jno. vii. 49 ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος . . . ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν. On the other hand, attributives in such constructions may stand either in the Plur. or the Sing.; — in the Sing. when they precede

the Substantive, as Mark ix. 15 *πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες . . . ἐξεθαμβή-
 481 θησαν* (Luke xix. 37 ; Acts v. 16 ; xxi. 36 ; xxv. 24), Luke xxiii. 1
 7th ed. *ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος ἤγαγον αὐτόν*. Yet in the N. T. the
 regular construction of Collectives with a Sing. Pred. is the more
 usual. The Plural construction often occurs in the Sept. also, as
 in Judg. ii. 10 ; Ruth iv. 11 ; 1 Sam. xii. 18 f. ; 1 Kings iii. 2 ;
 viii. 66 ; xii. 12 ; Isa. li. 4 ; Judith vi. 18 (*λαός* is almost invariably
 construed with a Plural verb), and it is by no means rare in Greek
 authors ; as, Her. 9, 23 *ὥς σφι τὸ πλῆθος ἐπεβοήθησαν*, Philostr.
 her. p. 709 *ὁ στρατὸς ἄθθυμοι ἦσαν*, Thuc. 1, 20 ; 4, 128 ; Xen. Mem.
 4, 3, 10 ; Aelian. anim. 5, 54 ; Plutarch. Mar. p. 418 c. ; Pausan.
 7, 9, 3 ; see Reitz, Lucian. VI. 533 Lehm ; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 446 ;
 Krüger, Dion. H. p. 234 ; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 529 sq. ; Ellendt,
 Arrian. Alex. I. 105.

458 Here belongs in the main also 1 Tim. ii. 15 *σωθήσεται δὲ (ἡ γυνή) διὰ*
 6th ed. *τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν μείνωσιν (αἱ γυναῖκες) ἐν πίστει*, for *ἡ γυνή* which is to
 539 be supplied is to be understood of the whole sex. But in Jno. xvi. 32 *ἵνα*
σκορπισθῇτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια, the Plural verb is not the immediate pred-
 icate of *ἕκαστος*, but *ἕκαστος* is annexed to the Plural as explanatory, as
 in Acts ii. 6 *ἤκουον εἰς ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ*, Rev. xx. 13 (v. 8) 1 Pet.
 iv. 10 ; Acts xi. 29 ; see Hes. scut. 283 ; Aelian. anim. 15, 5 ; Var. Hist.
 14, 46 ; Wesseling, Diod. Sic. II. 105 ; Brunck, Aristoph. Plut. 784 ; Jacobs,
 Achill. Tat. p. 622. Similar to this is Acts ii. 12 and 1 Cor. iv. 6 *ἵνα μὴ*
εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου. On the other hand, in
 Acts ii. 3 a suggestion of the Singular subject for *ἐκάθισε* (for *ἐκάθισαν* is
 obviously a correction, to conform to *ὥφθησαν*) is contained in *ἐφ' ὅσα*
ἕκαστον αὐτῶν. Other instances of a transition from the Plur. of a verb
 to the Sing. have been collected by Heind. Plat. Protag. p. 499 ; Jacobs,
 Aelian. anim. II. 100.

Collectives have influenced only the gender of the Pred. in Luke x. 13
*εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγενήθησαν αἱ δυνάμεις . . . πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καθή-
 μενοι* (the inhabitants) *μετενόησαν*.

Note 1. Some have thought that a *preceding* Sing. verb construed with
 a (Masc. or Fem.) Plural Subject (the schema Pindaricum, Mth. 766 ;
 Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 86) occurs in Luke ix. 28 *ἐγένετο . . . ὥσει ἡμέραι ὀκτώ*.
 But *ἐγένετο* is to be taken by itself, and *ὥσει ἡμέραι ὀκτώ* as a detached
 expression of time inserted parenthetically, see § 62, 2. On the other
 hand, in Luke ix. 13 *εἰσὶν* is not construed with *πλέον*, but the latter is an
 unconnected insertion (cf. Xen. Anab. 1, 2, 11), and *εἰσὶν* belongs to *ἄνθρωποι*.
 That the Imperat. *ἄγε*, which is nearly a pure interjection, is connected
 with a Plural subject without disturbing the construction, in Jas. iv. 13
ἄγε νῦν οἱ λέγοντες and v. 1 *ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλουῖσιοι*, is obvious. This
 usage is frequent in Greek prose authors, e.g. Xen. Cyr. 4, 2, 47 ; 5, 3, 4 ;

Apol. 14; cf. Alberti, observ. on Jas. iv. 13; Palairret, observ. p. 502 sq.; Wetsten. N. T. II. 676; Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 52 (similar to which is the Latin *age*, Hand, Tursell. I. 205). Likewise *φέρει* is so used Himer. orat. 17, 6.

Note 2. Here may be introduced also a remark, in passing, on the usage according to which a Plural verb and pronoun are employed by an individual speaker in reference to himself (Glass. I. 320 sqq.). The ^{7th} communicative force is still manifest in Mark iv. 30 *πῶς ὁμοιωσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ ὥθμεν*; Jno. iii. 11. It occurs much more frequently in the Epistles (as among the Romans scripsimus, misimus), where the author speaks in his apostolic character, as in Rom. i. 5; cf. vs. 6 (otherwise explained by van Hengel, Rom. p. 52), Col. iv. 3 cf. the immediately following *δέδεμαι*, Heb. xiii. 18 cf. vs. 19; Gal. i. 8. Only it is necessary to distinguish from this usage the case in which the writer really includes other persons, though it may be difficult in particular instances to specify when and what persons he means besides himself, and at any rate that cannot be determined on grammatical grounds. In Eph. i. 3 ff. and 1 Cor. iv. 9 the Plural proper is undoubtedly used. As to Jno. xxi. 24 see Mey. (In 1 Cor. xv. 31 according to the reading *καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω, νῆ τὴν ἡμετέραν καύχῃσιν, ἣν ἔχω*, the Sing. and the Plur. would be used together; but *ἡμετέραν* [which also Cod. Sin. gives] is here unquestionably to be preferred.)

5. Such sentences as the following are *not* to be regarded as instances of grammatical discord between the Subj. and Pred.: Matt. vi. 34 *ἄρκετον τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς*, 2 Cor. ii. 6 *ἵκανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἡ ἐπιτιμία αὐτῇ*. The Neuters here are used as substantives: *a sufficiency for such a one is*, like *triste lupus stabulis* (Virg. ecl. 3, 80) *a sad thing for the folds*, (Ast, Plat. polit. p. 413; Hm. Vig. p. 699). Instances in Greek authors are: Her. 3, 36 *σοφὸν ἡ προμηθεῖα*, Xen. Hi. 6, 9 *ὁ πόλεμος φοβερόν*, Diog. L. 1, 98 *καλὸν ἡ συχία*, Xen. M. 2, 3, 1; Plat. legg. 4, 707 a.; Plut. paedag. 4, 3; Lucian. philops. 7; Isocr. Demon. p. 8; Plat. conviv. p. 176 d.; Aristot. rhet. 2, 2, 46 and eth. Nic. 8, 1, 3; Lucian. fug. 13; Plut. mul. virt. p. 225 Tauchn.; Aelian. anim. 2, 10; Dio Chr. 40. 494; Sext. Emp. math. 11, 96. Cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 51; Wetsten. I. 337; Kypke, obs. I. 40; Fischer, Well. III. a. p. 310 sq.; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 237, ed. Lips.; Held, Plut. Timol. p. 367 sq.; Kühner, Gr. II. 45; Waitz, Aristot. categ. p. 292. In Lat. cf. Ovid. amor. 1, 9, 4; Cic. off. 1, 4; famil. 6, 21; Virg. eclog. 3, 82; Aen. 4, 569; Stat. Theb. 2, 399; Vechner, Hellenol. p. 247 sqq. (As to the rhetorical emphasis sometimes involved in this use of the Neuter, see Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 396.)

Of a different sort, but also deserving of notice, is the construction in 1 Pet. ii. 19 *τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις*; cf. *τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀνάμνησις* Demosth. and upon it Schaefer appar. V. 289; Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 305.

6. If the Subject, or the Predicate, or both, be compound (Mth. 760), the grammatical form of the Predicate is determined according to the following rules:

a. If the Subject is composed of the 1st Person and 3d, the verb is put in the 1st Pers. Plur., as Jno. x. 30 *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐσμεν*, 1 Cor. ix. 6 *ἡ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρνάβας οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν* etc. 483 (1 Cor. xv. 11); Matt. ix. 14; Luke ii. 48 (Eurip. Med. 1020); 74 d but in Gal. i. 8 we find *ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἡ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται*, the latter Subject being regarded as the more exalted, Isa. 11, 10. When, on the other hand, to the 2d Pers. is annexed a 3d, the 541 former receives the preference as the more important, and the verb (which precedes) is put in the 2d Pers., as in Acts xvi. 31 *σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἰκός σου* xi. 14.

b. When the several Subjects Sing. are of the 3d Person, or are impersonal objects,

a) the Pred., if it *follows*, is regularly put in the Plural, as in Acts iii. 1 *Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀνέβαινον*, iv. 19; xii. 25; xiii. 46; xiv. 14; xv. 35; xvi. 25; xxv. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Jas. ii. 15; and its Gender is Masculine when there is a Masc. among the Subjects, 2 Pet. iii. 7. An adjective belonging to them all agrees sometimes only with the first or the principal Subject, as in Acts v. 29 *ἀποκριθεὶς Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι εἶπαν*; in the opposite case, Acts iv. 19, the Adj. is in the Masculine when the nouns are 460 of different sex, as Acts xxv. 13 *Ἀγρίππας καὶ Βερνίκη κατήντησαν* 64 d ... *ἀσπασάμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*, Jas. ii. 15. When the disjunctive *ἢ* is used, a Singular Pred. also follows several Subjects, as in Matt. v. 18; xii. 25; xviii. 8; Eph. v. 5.

β) if the Pred. *precedes*, it is put either in the Plural, in case the author had in mind a plurality of Subjects, Mark x. 35 *προπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης*, Jno. xxi. 2, hence with *καὶ ... καὶ* or *τε ... καὶ* Luke xxiii. 12 *ἐγένοντο φίλοι ὁ τε Πιλάτος καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης* (Acts i. 13; iv. 27; v. 24; xviii. 5), Tit. i. 15 *μεμΐανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοὺς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις*; or in the Singular, if the Subjects are to be conceived separately, 1 Tim. vi. 4 *ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημίαι* etc. Rev. ix. 17 (Thuc. 1, 47; Plat. Gorg. 503 e.; 517 d.; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 1; Quint. inst. 9, 4, 22); 1 Cor. xiv. 24 *ἐὰν εἰέλθῃ τις ἄπιστος ἢ ἰδιώτης* (so commonly when there is a disjunction by *ἢ* 1 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Pet.

iv. 15) [?]; Acts v. 38; .xx. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 34; or only the first Subject, usually as the principal one, is specially taken into consideration, Jno. ii. 2 ἐκλήθη (καὶ) ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, iv. 53; viii. 52; xviii. 15; xx. 8; Acts xxvi. 30; Luke xxii. 14; Matt. xii. 3; Philem. 23; Rev. i. 3; xii. 7, etc.; Plat. Theag. 124 e.; Paus. 9, 13, 3; 9, 36, 1; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 25; Mdv. S. 3 f. In such case a predicate participle or adjective is put in the Plural, as in Luke ii. 33 ἦν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες, Rev. viii. 7. Cf., in general, Herm. Vig. p. 194; d'Orville, Charit. 497; Schoem. Isae. 462. When the Subjects are connected by ἡ Greek authors usually employ the Plural of the verb, cf. Porson, Eurip. Hecub. p. 12, Lips.; Schaef. Melst. p. 24; Schoem. Isae. p. 295 (exactly as after ἄλλος ἄλλω and the like, see Jacobs, Philostr. p. 377). The distinction which Matth. Eurip. Hec. 84; Sprachl. II. 768 set up, is not perceptible, at least in the N. T. (The Sing. 542 is used quite regularly in the following arrangement, εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἡ ἄγγελος . . . Acts xxiii. 9.)

By means of this construction very decided prominence is imparted to 484 one subject out of several in Jno. ii. 12 κατέβη εἰς Καφαρναούμ αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, iv. 12, 53; Luke vi. 3; viii. 22; Acts vii. 15, and the propriety of using the Singular Pred. here is obvious. This mode of expression is of frequent occurrence in Hebrew (Gesen. Lehrs. 722), and (even in the form αὐτός τε καὶ ὁ καὶ αὐτὸς καί Ruth i. 3, 6) is not rare in Greek authors, Matth. Eurip. Iphig. A. 875; Weber, Demosth. 261; Fr. Mr. p. 70, 420; cf. Demosth. Euerg. 688 a. εἰ διωμεί ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῃ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ τὰ παῖδιά etc. Alciph. 1, 24 ὡς ἂν ἔχοιμι σώζεσθαι αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ τὰ παῖδιά.

7. When several Subjects or Predicates are united in a single proposition, the copulative particle is, according to the most simple construction, put before the last; whereas the disjunctive ἢ must stand before each of the successive words, as in Matt. vi. 31 τί φάγωμεν ἢ τί πίνομεν ἢ τί περιβαλόμεθα; Luke xviii. 29 ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα. Even the copulative is sometimes used in this manner, as in Rom. ii. 7 τοῖς δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι, xi. 33; xii. 2 (Lucian. Nigr. 17), see Fr. Rom. II. 553. When such a series of words is introduced by ὡς, this particle is used but once, at the beginning; in 1 Pet. iv. 15, on the other hand, the repetition of ὡς before ἁλλοτριοεπίσκοπος separates this predicate from those that precede, and gives it independent prominence. The connecting particle is thus not unfre- 461 quently repeated before each word of a whole series (*polysyndeton*), ^{6th ed.}

a usage which is partly to be considered as merely an imitation of the Hebrew mode of expression (Ewald, krit. Gr. 650) Matt. xxiii. 23; Rev. xvii. 15; xviii. 12; xxi. 8, and partly seems to arise from an effort to secure due attention to the import of each word, as in Rom. vii. 12 ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή, ix. 4 ὦν ἡ νιοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, Luke xiv. 21 τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ ἀναπήρους καὶ τυφλοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς εἰσάγαγε, 1 Pet. i. 4; iii. 8; Jno. xvi. 8; Acts xv. 20, 29; xxi. 25; Phil. iv. 12; Rev. ii. 19; v. 12; vii. 9, 12; viii. 5; Philostr. Apoll. 6, 24; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 32. So in particular with proper names, Acts i. 13; xiii. 1; xx. 4; Matt. iv. 25; Jno. xxi. 2. On the other hand, the connective of the different parts of a single sentence is entirely omitted (*asyndeton*),

a. In enumerations, 2 Tim. iii. 2 ἔσονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι φίλαντοι, φιλάργυροι, ἀλάζονες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι etc., 1 Cor. iii. 12 ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, λίθους τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην, 1 Pet. iv. 3; Heb. xi. 37; 1 Tim. i. 10; iv. 13, 15 (Cic. fam. 2, 5; Attic. 13, 13); Rom. i. 29 ff.; ii. 19; Phil. iii. 5; Jno. v. 3; 1 Cor. xiii. 4-8; xiv. 26; 2 Cor. iv. 8 f.; Jas. v. 6; 543 1 Pet. ii. 9; Matt. xv. 19 (Col. iii. 11 is peculiar). Similar are Demosth. Phil. 4 p. 54 a. and Pantaen. p. 626 a.; Plat. Gorg. p. 503 e.; 517 d.; rep. 10 p. 598 c.; Lycurg. 36, 2; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 2; Heliod. 1, 5.

b. In parallelisms and antitheses, which thus receive additional prominence, 2 Tim. iv. 2 ἐπίσθηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως (like nolens 485 volens, honesta turpia, digni indigni, ἄνω κάτω, Aristoph. ran. 157 7th ed. ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν, Beier, Cic. off. I. 135; Kritz, Sall. I. 55; II. 323), 1 Cor. iii. 2 γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα, vii. 12; Jno. x. 16; Jas. i. 19. Yet *asyndeton* in such cases is not necessary, Col. ii. 8; 1 Cor. x. 20; cf. Fr. Mr. p. 31 sq. who, however, has drawn a distinction between the two modes of expression which seems to me too subtle.

When some of the Subjects are in the Plural, the verb following is put in the Plural, Acts v. 17, 29. This, however, seems not to be indispensable, Diod. S. 20, 72 δάκρυα καὶ δέησεις καὶ θρήνος ἐγένετο συμφορητός, Xen. rep. Ath. 1, 2.

Note. When several substantives either in the Subject or the Predicate are connected by καί, the first sometimes denotes an individual comprehended in the second as its genus, as Ζεὺς καὶ θεοί. After the second, therefore, λοιποί was supplied; but the intention of the expression is to give prominence to the individual as the principal subject, as in Acts v. 29

ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι (Theodoret. III. 223 ; see Schaef. Sophocl. II. 314, 335), i. 14 ; Mark xvi. 7 ; Matt. xvi. 14 (yet see Mey. in loc.) cf. Mark x. 41.

This schema κατ' ἐξοχήν (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 221) is an established idiom in Greek authors, cf. Plat. Protag. p. 310 d. ὁ Ζεὺς καὶ θεοί (Plaut. capt. 5, 1, 1 ; Jovi diisque ago gratias), Iliad. 19, 63 Ἑκτορι καὶ Τρωσὶ, Aeschin. Timarch. p. 171 c. Σόλων ἐκείνος, ὁ παλαιὸς νομοθέτης, καὶ ὁ Δράκων καὶ οἱ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἐκείνους νομοθέται, Aristoph. nub. 412 (Chrysippus et Stoici Cic. Tusc. 4, 5, 9), see Ast, Theophr. char. p. 120 ; Stallb. Plat. 462 Protag. p. 25. On Eurip. Med. 1141, which Elmsley adduced in support of this idiom, see Hm. Med. p. 392 ed. Lips., besides Locella Xen. Ephes. p. 208. (Of a different yet kindred nature is the Latin phrase exercitus equitatusque, Caes. b. gall. 2, 11.)

8. If two predicative verbs have a common *object*, and both verbs govern the same case, the object is expressed only once, as in Luke xiv. 4 *ἰάσατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν*, Matt. iv. 11. In Greek authors, too, the object is regularly but once expressed even when the verbs govern different cases, Krii. 227. In the N. T., when the verbs govern different cases, the object is usually repeated in the form of a pronoun, as in Luke xvi. 2 *φωνήσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν αὐτῷ*, yet cf. Acts xiii. 3 *ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν*, Eph. v. 11 *μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐλέγγετε*, 2 Thess. iii. 15 ; 1 Tim. vi. 2, see § 22, 1 p. 143.

9. Of the three constituent parts of a proposition, the subject and the predicate are indispensable ; but the simple copula is implied in the mere juxtaposition of the subject and predicate: ὁ θεὸς σοφός (which in Greek can only mean, *God is wise*). The same holds also when the subject and the predicate are extended, as in Heb. v. 13 *πᾶς ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης*, 2 Cor. i. 21 ; Rom. xi. 15 ; see § 64, 2. But as the predicate is usually blended with the copula, so the subject may be implied in the copula, or in the blended copula and predicate. This takes place, independently of any special context,

a. When the verb is in the 1st or 2d Pers. (where the subjects are conceived as present, Mdv. p. 6) usually, as in Jno. xix. 22 *ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα*, Rom. viii. 15 *οὐκ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας*, as here even the pronouns ἐγώ, σύ are expressed only when emphasis is intended, see § 22, 6. If now the name of the subject be annexed to the pronoun of the 1st or 2d Pers., as in Gal. v. 2 *ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν* (Eph. iii. 1 ; Rom. xvi. 22 ; 2 Cor. x. 1 ; Philem. 19 ; Rev. i. 9 ; xxii. 8, etc.), Gal. ii. 15 *ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι ...*

εἰς Χριστ. Ἰησ. ἐπιστεύσαμεν (2 Cor. iv. 11) Luke xi. 39, the adjunct is in apposition.

b. When the verb is in the 3d Pers. (impersonally), and then

a) a Plur. Active is used, if merely (acting) subjects generally are meant (Mdv. S. 7); Matt. vii. 16 *μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλήν*; do *they* (people) gather etc., does one gather etc. Jno. xv. 6; xx. 2; Mark x. 13; Acts iii. 2; Luke xvii. 23; Rev. xii. 6. See Fischer, Weller. III. I. 347; Duker, Thucyd. 7, 69; Bornem. Schol. p. 84.

β) a Sing. Active, when no definite subject is meant (Mdv. S. 7) of which the verb is predicated, but only the action or condition is designated as a fact: *ὑει, βροντᾷ* (Jno. xii. 29 *βροντῇ γίνεται*) *it rains*, etc. (cf. Germ. *es liutet*), 1 Cor. xv. 52 *σαλπίζει* *there will be a sound of trumpets*, also 2 Cor. x. 10 *αἱ ἐπιστολαί, φησί, βαρεῖαι*, *it is said* (Wisd. xv. 12). Yet, according to the concrete conception of the Greeks, this idiom may, strictly, be elliptical: *ὑει, βροντᾷ Ζεὺς* (Xen. H. 4, 7, 4), *σαλπίζει ὁ σαλπυκτής*, like the *ἀναγνώσεται* of the orators, see § 64, 3. On (the parenthetical) *φησί*, not infrequent in Greek authors, see Wolf, Demosth. Lept. p. 288; Wyttenbach, Plut. mor. II. 105; Boisson. 463 Eunap. p. 418, (in Latin *inquit*, *aît* is similar, see Heindorf, Horat. 6th ed. sat. p. 146; Ramshorn, Gramm. S. 383).

455 γ) More frequently, however, in such impersonal sense a Sing. Passive is used (Mdv. S. 8), as in 1 Cor. xv. 42 *σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ* (see v. Hengel in loc.), 1 Pet. iv. 6 *εἰς τοῦτο καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη* etc., Matt. vii. 2, 7; v. 21, etc. This form is connected with the 3d Pers. Plur. Active in a parallelism in Luke xii. 48 *ὃ ἐδόθη πολὺ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὃ παρέθεντο πολὺ, περισσώτερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν*.¹

The forms of quotation, *λέγει* 2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16; Eph. iv. 8 etc., *φησί* 1 Cor. vi. 16; Heb. viii. 5, *εἶρηκε* Heb. iv. 4 (cf. the rabbinic *אמר*, see Surenhus. βιβλ. καταλλ. p. 11), *μαρτυρεῖ* Heb. vii. 17 (*εἶπε* 1 Cor. xv. 27), were probably never intended by the N. T. writers to be taken impersonally; but for the most part the Subject (ὁ θεός) is directly or indirectly 487 7th ed. contained in the context. In 1 Cor. vi. 16 and Matt. xix. 5, however, in connection with *φησί* and *εἶπεν* there is an apostolic ellipsis (of ὁ θεός). Lastly, in Heb. vii. the best authorities [Sin. also] give *μαρτυρεῖται*.

There is nothing at all impersonal in Jno. xii. 40 (one acquainted with

¹ It cannot, however, be inferred from this that the 3d Plural Active strictly has a Passive sense (as in Chald., see my Gram. § 49), for even in Luke xii. 20 *ἀπατεῖσιν* may be taken concretely; see Bornem. in loc.

the Scriptures easily supplies ὁ Θεός), 1 Cor. xv. 25 (θῇ scilicet Χριστός from αὐτόν), Rom. iv. 3, 22 ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβρ. τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην sc. τὸ πιστεῦσαι from ἐπίστευσ., Jno. vii. 51 εἰ μὴ ἀκούσῃ where ὁ νόμος is to be repeated, which is personified as a judge; in 1 Jno. v. 16 from αἰτήσῃ the word αἰτούμενος (θεός) might be supplied as the Subject of δώσει (Lücke) more suitably than αἰτῶν: lastly, in Heb. x. 38 εἰς ὑποστείλγται it would perhaps be most simple to educe the general term ἄνθρωπος from ὁ δίκαιος.

The Predicate is involved in εἶναι when it signifies *existere*, Matt. xxiii. 30 εἰ ἤμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων etc., Jno. viii. 58; Rev. xxi. 1 ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι. In this sense adverbs are then annexed for closer specification in 1 Cor. vii. 26 καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι.

§ 59. EXTENSION OF A SIMPLE SENTENCE IN ITS SUBJECT AND PREDICATE: ATTRIBUTIVES, APPPOSITION.

1. The Subject and the Predicate of a proposition may be extended in a great variety of ways by adjuncts: And first of all *attributively*, most commonly by means of adjectives, see no. 2. Personal nouns in particular which denote office, character, etc., receive, with little extension of signification, general personal attributives in the substantives ἄνθρωπος, ἀνὴρ, γυνή etc. (Mtth. 967) Matt. xviii. 23 ὁμοιώθη . . . ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, xiii. 45; xx. 1; xxi. 33 (Iliad. 16, 263 ἄνθρωπος ὀδότης, Xen. Cyr. 8, 7, 14; Plato, Gorg. 518 c.); Acts iii. 14 ἤτήσασθε ἄνδρα φονέα χαρισθῆναι ὑμῖν, i. 16; Luke xxiv. 19 (Plat. Ion. p. 540 d. ἀνὴρ στρατηγός, Thuc. 464 1, 74; Palaeph. 28, 2 ἀνὴρ ἀλιεύς, 38, 2; Plat. rep. 10, 620 b.; Xen. ⁶⁴ ed. Hi. 11, 1; see Fischer ind. ad Palaeph. sub ἀνὴρ, Vechner, Hellenol. p. 188. Cf. on the Hebrew idiom, my Simonis p. 54.). On the other hand, in 1 Cor. ix. 5 γυναῖκα is to be taken predicatively; it would be wrong, also, to refer to this head passages in which the attributive is strictly an adjective, as in Acts i. 11; xvii. 12; xxi. 9 (Nep. 25, 9); Jno. iv. 9. In the addresses ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται Acts ii. 22, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι xvii. 22; xix. 35 the emphasis lies on ἄνδρες, and renders the address one of respect (cf. Xen. An. 3, 2, 2). Similar forms of address are frequent in the Greek orators.

2. Adjectives (and participles) annexed to substantives attributively to supplement their meaning regularly stand *after* them, Luke ix. 37 συνήμνησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς, Rev. xvi. 2 ἐγένετο ἔλκος ⁷⁴ ed. κακὸν καὶ πονηρόν, Matt. iii. 4; Jno. ii. 6; 2 Tim. iv. 7 τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν ἡγωνίσμαι, Luke v. 36 ff.; Phil. iv. 1; Rev. vi. 12, 13, since the thing itself presents itself to the mind before its Predi-

cate. When, however, the adjective is to receive any degree of prominence, as directly or indirectly antithetical, it is put *before* the substantive; and this is peculiarly frequent in the didactic style: Matt. xiii. 24 *ὁμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ σπείραντι καλὸν σπέρμα* (vs. 25 *ἔσπειρεν ζιζάνια*), Luke viii. 15 *τὸ (πεσόν) ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ* (vss. 12, 13, 14); Jno. ii. 10 *πρῶτον τὸν καλὸν οἶνον τίθησιν, καὶ ὅταν μεθυσθῶσιν, τότε τὸν ἐλάσσῳ* (Rom. i. 23; xiii. 3; Mark i. 45; Matt. xii. 35); 1 Cor. v. 6 *ὅτι μικρὰ ζύμη ὄλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοί* (Jas. iii. 5); 1 Pet. iv. 10 *ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι* (the *κακοὶ οἰκ.* do not do so), Heb. x. 29 (cf. vs. 28); viii. 6; Rom. vi. 12 *μὴ βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι* (just because the *σῶμα* is *θνητόν*, it would be absurd to allow such dominion), 2 Pet. i. 4; Mark xiv. 6; Heb. ix. 11, 12; 1 Tim. i. 19; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. v. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 19. Hence in the apostolic diction *καινὴ κτίσις, καινὸς ἄνθρωπος*, and for the most part *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*. But even the adjective put after the substantive may be emphatic when made prominent by the article, Jno. iv. 11 *πόθεν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν*; x. 11 *ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός*, or when placed at the end of the sentence, as in Mark ii. 21 *οὐδεὶς . . . ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν*, Jno. xix. 41; Mark xvi. 17 *γλώσσας λαλήσουσι καιναῖς*. In one and the same verse we find an adjective preceding and another following the substantive, Tit. iii. 9 *μωρὰς ζητήσεις . . . μάχας νομικὰς*. In general, it must not be forgotten that it often depends on the writer whether he will emphasize the adjective or not. Thus in Jno. xiii. 34; 1 Jno. ii. 7, 8 *καινὴν ἐντολὴν* might have been put in distinct antithesis to the old commandments, but the Apostle says *ἐντολὴν καινὴν*, a commandment which is new. In Rev. iii. 12 we find *τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσ.* but xxi. 2 *Ἱερουσ. καινὴν*; and in 2 Pet. iii. 13 *καινοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν*, it was sufficient to emphasize the adjective by position merely the first time. In Acts vii. 36; Heb. xi. 29 we find *ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα*, but in the Sept. frequently *θάλασσα ἐρυθρά*.

When two or more adjectives connected by *καί* belong to *one* substantive, they are put before or after it, in accordance with the preceding distinctions, as in 1 Tim. ii. 2 *ἵνα ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν*, Matt. xxv. 21 *δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ*, Luke xxiii. 50 *ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος*, Acts xi. 24; Rev. iii. 14; xvi. 2. Such arrangements of words as in Matt. xxiv. 45 *ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος*, Heb. x. 34, are to be accounted for by the circumstance, that the writer afterwards introduces a second adjective to complete the sense, or has reserved it for the end of the sentence for the sake of force.

3. Two or more adjectives regularly are connected by *καί* and joined to their substantives, 1 Pet. i. 4 *εἰς κληρονομίαν ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἁμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον*, vs. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 14 etc. When the copula is omitted, it is either because the intention of the writer is to enumerate single qualities separately deserving of attention^{7th ed.} (§ 58, 6) 1 Tim. iii. 2 ff. *δεῖ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι, νηφάλιον, σώφρονα, κόσμιον* etc. Tit. i. 6; ii. 4 f.; Phil. ii. 2; Rev. v. 1 (Job i. 8) see § 58, 7, perhaps with climax Luke vi. 38 (Mtth. 998); or because one of the adjectives is more closely related to the substantive, and forms with it as it were *one* notion, 1 Pet. i. 18 *ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου*, Jno. xii. 3 *μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου*, where *νάρδος πιστικῆ* designates, commercially as it were, a certain sort of spikenard, which is then declared to be *πολύτιμος*, Jno. xvii. 3 *ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν*, Gal. i. 4; 1 Cor. x. 4; Rev. i. 16; ii. 12; xii. 3; xv. 6; xx. 11, (which is sometimes obvious from the mere position of the words, as in Jno. vii. 37 *ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς*, Heb. ix. 11). Cf. Her. 7, 23 *σίτος πολλὸς ἐφόιτα ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀηλεσμένος*, Dion. H. IV. 2097 *συναγαγόντες ἰδιωτικὸν συνέδριον πατρικόν*, see Mtth. 998; Dissen, Pindar. ed. Goth. 303 sq.; 548 Hm. Eurip. Hec. p. 54; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 807; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 71; cf. (Nep. 25, 9, 14; Cic. parad. 5, 2) Krititz, Sallust. Jug. 172. (When the second Predicate is a real participle, a connecting *καί* is of course not to be expected, Acts xxvii. 6 *εὐρὼν πλοίου Ἀλεξανδρίνου πλέον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν*, Mark xiv. 14; Rev. x. 1.)

When *πολύς* is annexed to a substantive that already has an adjective, it will either be construed according to the preceding rule, as in Jno. x. 32 *πολλὰ καλὰ ἔργα ἔδειξα*, 1 Tim. vi. 9, or written as in Acts xxv. 7 *πολλὰ τε καὶ βαρέα αἰτιώματα*, where the word expressing the quality is made prominent: *many and* (that, too,) *heavy* etc. Cf. Her. 4, 167; 8, 61; Xen. Mem. 2, 9, 6; Lys. 26, 1, see Mtth. 998. Under this head come also Jno. xx. 30 *πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα* (but xxi. 25 *ἄλλα πολλὰ*), and Luke iii. 18 *πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα* (which is not unknown also in Greek authors, see Kypke on the first passage) *many and other*, for which we say *many other*.

4. From the natural rule, that an adjective must agree with its substantive in gender and number, there is sometimes a deviation, when the writer allows regard for the thought to prevail over that for the grammatical form. That is

a. Neuter or Feminine substantives that signify persons have Masculine adjectives joined to them (Hm. Vig. p. 715), Rev.

xix. 14 τὰ στρατεύματα . . . ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ . . . ἐνδεδυμένοι
 βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρὸν, v. 6; Eph. iv. 17, 18; 1 Cor. xii. 2; Mark
 ix. 26 (Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 3 αἱ πόλεις . . . ὡς παύσαντες, Cyr. 1, 2,
 466 12; 7, 3, 8; Joseph. antt. 6, 11, 6; cf. Liv. 7, 2; still more bold
 7th ed. is Aristid. I. 267 extr. Jebb. ἄμιλλα καὶ σπονδὴ τῶν ἐκατέρωθεν
 μεγίστων πόλεων, καλούντων τι ὡς αὐτοῖς), Rev. xi. 15 ἐγένοντο
 φωναὶ μεγάλαι . . . λέγοντες (v. 13 f.); iv. 8 τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα, ἐν
 καθ' ἑν αὐτῶν ἔχων ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἕξ . . . καὶ ἀνάπυσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν
 ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς λέγοντες.

In Eph. iv. 18 ἰσχωριζόμενοι does not belong to the subordinate clause
 490 καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη, but to ὑμᾶς; and 2 Jno. 4 εὐρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου
 7th ed. περιπατοῦντας only borders upon the above usage.

b. Collectives (cf. § 58, 4) in the Sing. sometimes have adjectives after them in the Plural, as in Acts v. 16 συνήρχετο τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων Ἱερ. φέροντες ἀσθενεῖς etc. (xxi. 36; Luke xix. 37; cf. Diod. S. 5, 43; Xen. Eph. 1, 3; Palaiet, observ. p. 201); iii. 11 συνέδραμεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς . . . ἔκθαμβοι, Jno. xii. 12; Rev. vii. 9; xix. 1 (Philostr. Apoll. 2, 12); Luke ii. 13 πλῆθος
 549 στρατιᾶς οὐρανοῦ αἰνούντων τὸν θεόν etc. On the other hand, in Rev. iii. 9 τῶν λεγόντων is not an epithet of συναγωγῆς, but to be taken partitively. The Sing. and Plural connected, occur in Mark viii. 1 παμπόλλου ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἔχόντων, τί φάγωσι, Acts xxi. 36; cf. Diod. S. 14, 78 τοῦ πλῆθους συντρέχοντος . . . καὶ τοὺς μισθοὺς πρότερον ἀπαιτούντων, Virg. Aen. 2, 64 undique visendi studio Trojana juvenus circumfusa ruit certantque illudere capto. Further, see Poppo Thuc. I. 102 sq.; Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 36; Anab. p. 354; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 811; Hm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 301; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 103 sq.; Mtth. 976 f.

Noteworthy is the connection of two genders in Rev. xiv. 19 ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μέγαν, as even Tdf. reads, (ληνός is sometimes Masc., Sept. Gen. xxx. 38, 41, Vat.).¹ But in Acts xi. 28 Luke undoubtedly wrote λιμὸν μεγάλην . . . ἦτις, see Bornem. in loc. In Phil. ii. 1 all recent editors [with the exception of Lchm. and Tdf. 7th ed.] have substituted εἰ τινα for εἰ τις σπλάγχνα.

5. When an adjective refers to two or more substantives of different genders or numbers, it is

a. Usually repeated with each substantive, as in Mark xiii. 1 ἴδε

¹ Lücke (Apokal. II. 464) wants either to read with a single Codex τοῦ μεγάλου (which is probably a correction), or to assume a constructio ad sensum, the writer in using τὸν μέγαν having thought only of θυμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Lücke himself confesses that the latter assumption is pretty violent and harsh. See also Matthäi's small edition, p. 63.

ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί, Jas. i. 17 πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον, Rev. xxi. 1 οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινὴν, Jno. xi. 33; Acts iv. 7; 1 Cor. xiii. 2; Eph. i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 13 (3 Esr. iii. 5); cf. Aristot. Nicom. 7, 9, 1; Demosth. pac. 23 b. Or

b. Used only once: preceding, in the gender and number of the first substantive, Luke x. 1 εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον, 1 Thess. v. 23; Rev. xiii. 7; vi. 14; vii. 9; cf. Diod. S. 1, 4 μετὰ πολλῆς κακοπαθείας καὶ κινδύνων, Dem. Con. 728 a.; Plutarch. mor. 993 a.; on the other hand, when placed after the substantives, it is sometimes in the Plur. and sometimes in the Sing., and its gender is that of the nearest or principal substantive, as in Heb. ix. 9 δῶρά ⁴⁶⁷ τε καὶ θυσῖαι προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι etc. iii. 6 ἐὰν τὴν παρῆρσίαν ^{6th ed} καὶ τὸ καύχημα μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατὰσχῶμεν (var.), Rev. viii. 7. 550 Cf. Iliad. 2, 136 sq. αἱ ἡμέτεραί τ' ἄλοχοι καὶ νήπια τέκνα εἶατ' ἐνὶ ⁴⁹¹ μεγάροις ποτιδόμεναι, Thuc. 8, 63 πυθόμενος . . . καὶ τὸν Στρουβι- ^{7th ed} χιδην καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀπεληλυθότα, Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 60. If the substantives are of the same gender, or if the adjective employed has not different forms to express different genders, it is usually expressed but once; — with the first substantive as in Acts ii. 43; Matt. iv. 24; Mark ii. 15; Eph. i. 21; 1 Cor. xi. 30 (2 Pet. i. 10); Rev. vi. 15, or with the second as in 2 Cor. . 6.

The Plural of an adjective which belongs to two substantives may appear to be used in 1 Pet. i. 18 οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσῷ ἐλυτρώθητε; but φθαρτ. must be regarded as a substantive, and ἀργ. and χρ. as explanatory specifications in apposition to it: *not with corruptible things, silver or gold etc.*

6. *Predicative amplifications*, which we introduce by *as* or *for*, *to*, are very frequent: 1 Tim. ii. 7 εἰς δ' ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κήρυξ, 1 Cor. x. 6 ταῦτα τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, vs. 11; xv. 26; Matt. i. 18; Jno. iii. 2; xii. 46; 2 Tim. i. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 5 αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικός, 1 Cor. ix. 5 ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν, Rom. iii. 25 ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον, Jas. v. 10 ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε . . . τοὺς προφῆτας, Acts vii. 10; xix. 19; xx. 28; xxv. 14; xxvi. 5; Luke xx. 43; 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 1 Jno. iv. 10, 14 (2 Thess. ii. 13 according to the reading ἀπαρχὴν) Heb. i. 2; xii. 9; 2 Pet. iii. 1; Rev. xiv. 4. Sometimes such a Predicate is made prominent by the comparative particle ὡς, as in 2 Cor. x. 2 λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας, 1 Cor. iv. 1; cf. 2 Thess. iii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 1 f.; or the Hebraistic construction with εἰς is adopted, as in Acts xiii. 22 ἡγείρεν τὸν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς

βασιλέα, vs. 47; vii. 21; see p. 228. On making the Predicate precede, see § 61.

The Predicate is sometimes an adjective, as in Heb. vii. 24 ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην, Mark viii. 17; Heb. v. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 22; Matt. xii. 13 ἀπεκατεστάθη (ἡ χεὶρ) ὑγίης, Acts xiv. 10; xxvii. 43; xxviii. 13; Rom. x. 19; 1 Cor. iv. 9; ix. 17; Mark iv. 28; or a pronoun, as in Rom. ix. 24 οὗς (σκεύη ἐλέους) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, Jno. iv. 23; Heb. x. 20. On the other hand, a Predicate is sometimes annexed to a pronoun, as in 1 Pet. iii. 21 ὃ (ὕδωρ) καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει.

Such Predicates are sometimes to be taken proleptically (Bornem. Luc. p. 39; Krü. 210), as in Matt. xii. 13 ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑγίης i.e. ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑγιῇ (Luke xiii. 35 var.) Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 13.

551 7. Especially diversified are the *appositive* adjuncts,¹ which, an-
468 nexed asyndetically, are intended mainly to define more closely one
6th ed. nominal (or pronominal) notion by another. But apposition is,

492 a. *Synthetic*, in the case of proper names which are distin-
7th ed. guished by the species or genus, or, if they belong in common to
a plurality of persons or of objects, by a distinctive quality: Matt.
iii. 6 ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, Heb. xii. 22 προσεληλύθατε Σιών ὅρει,
Acts x. 32 οἰκία Σίμωνος βυρσέως, Heb. vii. 4 δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ
ἔδωκεν . . . ὁ πατριάρχης, Acts xxi. 39; Rev. ii. 24.

b. *Partitive* (Rost 484): 1 Cor. vii. 7 ἕκαστος ἰδίον ἔχει χάρισμα,
ὁ μὲν οὕτως, ὁ δὲ οὕτως, Matt. xxii. 5; Acts xvii. 32; xxvii. 44,
more simply in Acts ii. 6 ἤκουον εἰς ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ etc.,
Eph. iv. 25.

c. *Parathetic*, when some characteristic of a person or thing is
expressed: Luke xxiii. 50 Ἰωσήφ, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος, Jno.
xiii. 14 εἰ ἐγὼ ἐνῆφα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος,
viii. 40; Heb. ix. 24; Acts xxii. 12; Jas. i. 8; Matt. xiv. 20;
Rom. vii. 19; cf. 1 Pet. v. 1, etc.

d. *Epeexegetic*, when a more precise expression is added, which
we should introduce by *namely, that is to say*: Eph. i. 7 ἐν ᾧ
ἔχομεν (vs. 10) τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν . . . τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμά-
των, 1 Pet. v. 8 ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν, διάβολος, Eph. i. 13; ii. 15;
iv. 13; Phil. iv. 18; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. v. 1; vii. 6; Rom. viii. 23;
Jno. vi. 27; vii. 2; Mark xii. 44; Acts viii. 38; 1 Jno. v. 20;
Judo 4; Rev. xii. 1, etc. So also after pronouns, as in Jno. ix. 13

¹ Well-considered views are contained in *J. D. Weickert's* Progr. on Apposition in German, Lübben, 1829. 4to. Further, cf. *Mehlhorn* de Appositione in Graeca ling. Glog. 1838 (*Sommer* in the Zeitschr. für Alterthumswiss. 1839. nr. 125 f.), *Rost*, Gramm. 482 f.

ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν . . . τὸν ποτε τυφλόν, 1 Thess. iv. 3 τοῦτό ἐστι θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν (Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 15; Plat. rep. 9, 583 d.; Gorg. 478 c.); 2 Cor. ii. 1 ἔκρινα ἐμὰντῷ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ . . . ἐλθεῖν (Rost 486); Eph. i. 19 εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας, Rom. xiv. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 9; Phil. iii. 3; Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. i. 21; ii. 7 (2 Pet. iii. 2); 1 Jno. ii. 16; iii. 24¹ etc. (Bornem. Luc. p. 114 sq.); 1 Cor. xvi. 21 ὁ ἀσπασμός τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου i.e. τῇ χειρὶ μου Π. (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 74; Krü. 213 f.; Rost 483; cf. Cic. parad. 4, 8; Fam. 5, 12; Liv. 4, 2; 7, 40). Appositive adjuncts occur even after adverbs, as in Luke iv. 23 ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου (Aeschyl. Choeph. 654); Jas. iv. 1 πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι; οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν, ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν etc. Mark viii. 4; Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 7, 15. 552

Several words may be joined by apposition to one and the same subject, Rev. xii. 9; xiii. 16; and so sometimes an apposition consists of several parts, 2 Thess. ii. 3 sq. On the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 18 we are not (with Lchm. and Tdf.) to find in τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους an apposition to τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας, but that second Accusative depends on ἀποφεύγ. [see Huther and Wiesinger in loc.].

An apposition occurs also in Mark viii. 8 ἦσαν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων 498 ἐπὶ τὰ σπυρίδας *they took up remnants, seven baskets*; and in Matt. xvi. 13, 7th ed. according to the reading τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; the last words would be an apposition, see Bornem. Luc. p. LII. To reject μέ on the sole authority of Cod. B [and Cod. Sin.] (for versions cannot be counted here) with Fr. [Tdf.] and others [Lchm. puts it in brackets] I consider rash. Μέ here may be cumbersome, but I cannot regard it as inadmissible: who do people say that I, the Son of Man, am? He himself had always styled himself the Son of Man, and now desires to hear what idea the people have of him as the Son of Man. As to other passages, in which the Dutch critics in particular have taken offence at such appositions and made hasty alterations in the text, see Bornem. diss. de glossem. N. T. cap. 5 prefixed to his Scholia on Luke.

We must likewise refer to the head of Apposition the well-known use 469 of ἄλλος before a substantive, which occurs not only in Homer, e.g. Odys. 8th ed. 2, 412 μῆτηρ δ' ἐμοὶ οὔτι πέπνυται οὐδ' ἄλλαι δμῳαί i.e. *nor other persons* (that is) *servants*, 1, 132 (cf. Thiersch, Gr. p. 588), but also in prose authors, e.g. Plato, Gorg. 473 c. εὐδαιμονίζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν

¹ The personal pronoun included in a verb takes an apposition in 1 Pet. v. 1 παρακαλῶ (ἐγὼ) ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς etc. cf. Lucian. d. deor. 24, 2; Thuc. 1, 137; Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 42. To this head may be referred also 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτά τινες ἦτε (ὑμεῖς, τινές σου, i.e. some).

ἄλλων ξένων *and the rest (namely) foreigners*, Xen. An. 5, 4, 25 οἱ πολέμοι
 μοῦ δὴ πάντες γενόμενοι ἐμάχοντο καὶ ἐξηκόντιζον τοῖς παλοῖς· καὶ ἄλλα
 δόρατα ἔχοντες, 1, 5, 5; cf. Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 128 sq. Lips.; Jacobs,
 Athen. p. 22 sq.; Krüger, Dion. p. 139; Poppo, Cyrop. p. 186; Vlc.
 Fritzsche, quæst. Lucian. p. 54 sq.; Zell, Aristot. ethic. p. 62. This is
 probably not to be applied to Jno. xiv. 16 καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν;
 but the analogous ἕτερος does appear to be so used in Luke xxiii. 32 ἦγοντο
 δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι, where from the
 expression Jesus also seems to be called κακοῦργος (cf. x. 1 ἀνέδειξεν ὁ
 κύριος καὶ ἐτέρους ἐβδομήκοντα δύο). See Thuc. 4, 67; Antiph. 6. 24.

Abbreviation combined with apposition occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 13: τὴν
 αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν πλατύνθητε καὶ ὑμεῖς, instead of τὸ αὐτό, ὃ ἐστὶν
 ἀντιμισθία, see Fr. diss. in 2 Cor. II. 113 sqq.

Epexegetical apposition may likewise be introduced by τοῦτ' ἔστιν, as in
 Rom. vii. 18 ἐν ἡμοῖς τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, Acts xix. 4; Mark vii. 2;
 Heb. ix. 11; xi. 16; xiii. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 20; Philem. 12. An apposition
 is annexed with emphasis by αὐτός in Eph. v. 23 ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ
 τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος.

An apposition appears to be incorporated into a relative clause in
 1 Jno. ii. 25 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν τὴν ζωὴν
 τὴν αἰώνιον, probably also in Phil. iii. 18 and 2 Cor. x. 13, see Mey. in
 loc., cf. Plat. Phaed. 66 c. τότε . . . ἡμῖν ἔσται οὐ ἐπιθυμοῦμεν . . . φρονήσεως,
 Hipp. maj. 281 c. οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐκείνοι; ὧν ὀνόματα μεγάλα λέγεται . . . Πιπτακοῦ
 558 καὶ Βίαντος; . . . φαίνονται ἀπεχόμενοι, rep. 3, 402 c.; 7, 533 c.; Apol. p. 41 a.;
 Lucian. Eunuch. 4.

8. That words in apposition, being co-ordinated with their prin-
 494 cipals, agree with them in case is the well-known rule. It does
 not extend to gender or number (Ramshorn, S. 294); since, in
 particular, a neuter (abstract) may be put in apposition with a
 personal noun, a plural with a collective singular, a singular with
 a plural, as Phil. iv. 1 ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί . . . χαρὰ καὶ στεφανός
 μου, 1 Cor. iv. 13; xv. 20; Col. iii. 4; Phil. iv. 18; Rev. i. 6;
 xvi. 3 (Soph. Oed. C. 472; Eurip. Troad. 432; Plin. epp. 9, 26
 Demosthenes, illa norma oratoris et regula, Liv. 1, 20, 3 virgines
 Vestae, Alba oriundum sacerdotium, 1, 27, 3; 8, 32, 5), 1 Cor. i. 2
 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡγιασμένους ἐν Χρ., τῇ οὐσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ,
 1 Jno. v. 16 δώσει αὐτῷ ζωὴν, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον,¹
 470 cf. 1 Kings xii. 10; Xen. Mem. 2, 3, 2; Hi. 3, 4. Cf. Vig. p. 41.
 6th ed.

¹ Bornemann's exposition (bibl. Studien der sächs. Geistl. I. 71), according to which
 αὐτῷ is referred to him that asks, and τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν is taken for a Dativ. commodi
 (he will give him life for them etc.), appears to me artificial. Αὐτῷ cannot well be
 referred to ἀδελφὸς ἁμαρτάνων ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, as αἰτεῖν here manifestly denotes
 intercession.

Still greater discordance occurs in the apposition contained in Col. iii. 5 νεκρώσατε τὰ μέλη . . . πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν etc., where the vices are placed beside the members employed in the indulgence of them, the results beside the instruments. See Matth. 974. But even from the agreement of the apposition with the noun in case (apart from what has been established above by 1 Cor. xvi. 21), there are exceptions:

a. It is a very common grammatical usage to annex the apposition in the genitive to the noun on which it depends (Bengel on Jno. ii. 21), as in 2 Pet. ii. 6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας (Odys. 1, 2; Thuc. 4, 46; Krü. 97, like urbs Romae, flumen Rheni in Latin, cf. also Hoffmann, Grammat. Syr. p. 298), Luke xxii. 1 ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων (2 Macc. vi. 7 Διονυσίων ἑορτή), ii. 41; Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 5 τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος *the earnest of the Spirit* (consisting in the Spirit), the Spirit as an earnest (Eph. i. 14), Rom. iv. 11 σημείον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς (where some authorities give περιτομήν as an emendation), Jno. ii. 21; xi. 13; Acts ii. 33; iv. 22; Rom. viii. 21; xv. 16; 1 Cor. v. 8; 2 Cor. v. 1; Eph. ii. 14; vi. 14, 16 f.; Col. iii. 24; Heb. vi. 1; xii. 11; Jas. i. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 3, etc. Under this head comes also Eph. iv. 9 κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα (μέρη) τῆς γῆς (γῆς, ἡ γῆς) *to the lower parts* i.e. the earth, or which constitute the earth (similar is Isa. xxxviii. 14 εἰς τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, cf. Acts ii. 19 ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω . . . ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω). The Apostle infers from ἀνέβη a κατέβη: now Christ strictly and properly came down on earth (and from it ascended again); this, contrasted with heaven, which is here called ὕψος, is spoken of as a deep or lower region. Christ's descent into Hades (to which the expression is referred in Evang. 7th ed. Apocr. p. 445) as an isolated fact cannot here be taken into consideration; it would be too restricted to refer the expression αἰχμαλωτεύειν αἰχμαλωσίαν to that. Finally, in Rom. viii. 23 also the interpretation of ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος *the Spirit as first-fruits*, that is, of God's gracious gifts, has not yet been conclusively disproved, even by Mey. and Philippi. The main argument against it, that the Genitive after ἀπαρχή is always (in biblical diction? yet cf. Exod. xxvi. 21; Deut. xii. 11, 17) partitive, is merely mechanical. According to this, we could never say: *my first-fruits, first-fruits of the Pentecost* etc. Living languages cannot be pent up within so narrow bounds, cf. Fr. Rom. II. 175. The Spirit is unquestionably a divine gift, as well as σωτηρία or κληρονομία, and may with perfect propriety be regarded as the first-

fruits of the gifts of God ; and this view is favored by the phrase ἀρραβὼν τοῦ πνεύματος more than Philippi is ready to admit On the other hand, πνεῦμα to signify the fulness of heavenly gifts *hereafter* is not current in biblical usage.¹ As for the rest, the Genitivus

471 appositionis is easily explicable from the nature of the Genitive
6th ed. (*the sign of circumcision*, the Genitive of the closer specification of a general notion), and is not unfrequent in the Oriental idiom (Gesen. Leirg. 677 ; Ewald 579), while in Greek it appears to be confined to the above geographical expression (and even this is on the whole rare). Not one of the instances adduced from Thuc. by Bauer, Philol. Thuc. Paull. p. 31 sqq., is entirely certain.² In Latin, however, cf. besides the expressions, quite usual in ancient languages but unnoticed by the moderns, verbum *scribendi*, vocabulum *silentii*, Cic. off. 2, 5 collectis ceteris causis, eluvionis, pestilentiae, vastitatis rel. (i.e. quae consistunt in eluv., pestilentia, etc.).

555 b. Sometimes we find the Nominative where the structure of the sentence would lead us to expect a different case, as in Jas. iii. 8 τὴν γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δύναται δαμάσαι· ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ. The last words are to be regarded as a sort of exclamation, and, therefore, annexed in an independent construction, cf. Mark xii. 40 ; Phil. iii. 18 f. So also might Rev. i. 5 ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός be taken. In Luke xx. 27 προσελθόντες τινὲς τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι etc., τῶν ἀντιλεπόντων would have been more precise, and nothing is gained

496 by a reference to Bhdy. S. 68 (Mey.). Moreover, the passage
7th ed. (Thuc. 1, 110) adduced by Bornem. in loc. is not entirely analogous. There is, however, some similarity in Corn. Nep. 2, 7 illorum urbem ut propugnaculum *oppositum* esse barbaris, where the gender (as in the above instance the case) is conformed to that, not of the substantive to which it in sense belongs, but of a subordinate substantive. Further, a parallel construction in the N. T. would be Mark vii. 19 according to the reading καθαρίζων. On the other hand, Demosth. Aristocrat. 458 a. ὁρᾷ . . . τῆς πόλεως οἰκοδομήματα καὶ κατασκευάσματα τηλικαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα, ὥστε . . . προπύλαια ταῦτα, νεώσοικοι, στοαί etc. appears to be an intentional

¹ It would be a great mistake to consider as an apposition the second Genitive in Col. ii. 17 ἃ ἐστὶ σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The words are undoubtedly to be so explained as to make Χριστοῦ a part of the predicate, and dependent on ἐστὶ : *but the body is of Christ, belongs to Christ*, is in, with, Christ.

² In the passages adduced by Mey. on Eph., as above, [1st. and 2d edns.] from Erfurdt's Soph. Antig. 355 and Schaeff. Apollon. Rhod. schol. p. 235, there is nothing connected with the Gen. apposit.

anacoluthon. And it is in general quite intelligible how even a word in apposition, if it is to be introduced as independent, is put in the Nominative without regard to the construction, — a sort of detached insertion.

In 2 Cor. xi. 28 ἡ ἐπισύστασις μου etc. is not an abnormal apposition to χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτός — such a solecism is not to be credited to Paul, — but Subject Nominative, and as such rendered prominent.

The apposition to a Vocative stands in the Nominative in Rom. ii. 1 ὁ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων, Rev. xi. 17; xvi. 7; cf. Bar. ii. 12; Acta apocr. p. 51, 60; the expegegesis in these cases is not construed with the Vocative, but introduced independently. Cf. Bhdy. S. 67. In Matt. vi. 9 the adjunct ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς could not have been annexed to πάτερ by means of the article in any other manner than it is, since the article has no Voc. form.

9. An apposition sometimes refers, not merely to single words, but also to *whole clauses* (Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 602; Monk, Eurip. Alcest. 7; Matth. Eurip. Phoen. 223; Sprachl. II. 970 f.; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 228; Krü. 215); and the nouns of which it consists, in the Nom. or Acc. according to the form of the sentence, ⁴⁷² may then frequently be resolved into an independent proposition ^{6th ed.} (Wannowski, syntax. anom. p. 47 sqq. 197 sq.):

a. Substantives in the Acc. (cf. also Lob. paralip. p. 519), as in Rom. xii. 1 παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν, i.e. ἥτις ἐστὶ λογ. λατρ. qui est cultus etc., 1 Tim. ii. 6 ὁ δὸς ἐαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους; — and in the Nominative, as in 2 Thess. i. 4 f. ὥστε ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν ⁵⁵⁶ πᾶσι τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς θλίψεσιν, αἵς ἀνέχεσθε, ἐνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ etc. (cf. Sueton. Calig. 16 decretum est, ut dies . . . Parilia vocaretur, *velut argumentum* rursus conditae urbis, Curt. 4, 7, 13 repente obductae coelo nubes condidere solem, *ingens* aestu fatigatis *auxilium*, Cic. Tusc. 1, 43, 102; Hor. sat. 1, 4, 110; Flor. 3, 21). See Eurip. Orest. 1105; Herc. fur. 59; 497 Electr. 231; Plat. Gorg. 507 d.; as to Latin, Ramshorn 296. ^{7th ed.} Bengel incorrectly applies this usage to Eph. i. 23 τὸ πλήρωμα etc. where occurs a perfectly simple appositive relation (to σώμα αὐτοῦ):

b. A Neuter adjective or participle refers to the whole clause in 2 Tim. ii. 14 διαμαρτυρ. ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου μὴ λογομαχεῖν, εἰς οὐδὲν χρήσιμον, Mark vii. 19 καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρῖζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα *which* (namely ἐκπορ. εἰς τ. ἀφ.) *purges all sorts of food*; yet see above, 8 b. cf. § 66, 3 g. (On the other hand,

we must not with Mey. take ἀνακαλυπτόμενον in 2 Cor. iii. 14 for such an impersonal apposition ; it is an attributive to κάλυμμα.)

In Rev. xxi. 17 μέτρον ἀνθρώπου is annexed as a loose apposition to ἐμέτρησε τὸ τεῖχος etc. A construction similar, but not exactly the same, is adduced by Mdv. S. 23.

10. The word in apposition naturally follows the main substantive, but for the sake of emphasis is sometimes separated from it by several intervening words ; as, 1 Cor. v. 7 τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη, Χριστός, Rom. viii. 28 ; 2 Cor. vii. 6 ; Heb. vii. 4 ; Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 144 ; Weber, Demosth. p. 152 ; Jas. i. 7 f. μὴ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, ὅτι λήψεται τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, ἀκατάστατος etc. we say *he, a double-minded man*. Rom. vii. 21 does not belong here ; and as to 2 Cor. xi. 2 see Mey. against Fr. The apposition *precedes*, for an obvious reason, in 1 Pet. iii. 7 οἱ ἄνδρες συνοικούντες . . . ὡς ἀσθενεστέρω σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ. But of a different nature is, for example, Tit. i. 3 κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ. Here the Predicate σωτὴρ ἡμῶν is the principal noun, but is explained epexegetically (since elsewhere Christ is so called) by the appositive θεός. So also in Rom. iv. 12 ; 1 Tim. ii. 3 ; 2 Tim. i. 10 ; Acts xxiv. 1 ; 1 Pet. iii. 15 ; v. 8 ; 2 Pet. i. 11 ; ii. 20 (iii. 7) ; Rev. ix. 11 ; Jno. vi. 27 ; Luke ii. 1 ; Jude 4 ; Heb. ii. 9 ; cf. Aeschin. ep. 6, p. 124 b. ; Paus. 1, 10, 5 ; Alciph. 3, 41 ; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 60. Frequently also in Latin, as in Cic. orat. 1, 18 ; Liv. 1, 14 ; 10, 35 ; 27, 1 ; Caes. b. gall. 4, 1, 10 ; afr. 98 ; Suet. Tib. 2 ; Galb. 4 ; Otho 1 ; Nep. 20, 1 ; 22, 3.

557 Under this head come also adjectives or substantives placed at the beginning of a sentence, when corresponding to epexegetical apposition : 473 they herald the contents of the sentence (Krü. 215 f ; Mdv. 229) : Heb. viii. 1 6th ed. κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγόμενοις τοιούτων ἔχουμεν ἀρχιερέα (Lycurg. orat. 17, 6), where it is not necessary to supply ἐστὶ. Cf. Rom. viii. 3 ; 1 Pet. iii. 8.

11. In conclusion, we must advert to the irregularities (solecisms) of government and apposition which occur in the Revelation (especially in the descriptions of visions), and which, from their number and nature, give the style the impress of considerable harshness ; see, besides the well-known works of Stolberg and 498 Schwarz (see above, p. 8), my exeget. Stud. I. 164 ff.¹ They are 7th ed.

¹ What Hitzig (on Joh. Marcus. Zürich, 1843. 8vo. S. 65 ff.) has collected respecting the language of the Revelation, serves a special critical purpose, and too much is put down to the account of the Hebrew element. A more moderate view is taken by Lürke, Apokal. II. 448 ff., who, however, in this particular sets too high a value on Hitzig's merits.

partly intended, and partly traceable to the writer's negligence. From a Greek point of view they may be explained as instances of *anacoluthon*, blending of two constructions, *constructio ad sensum*, *variatio structuræ*, as should always have been done, instead of attributing them to the ignorance of the author, or pronouncing them to be mere Hebraisms, since most of them would be anomalies even in Hebrew, and in producing many of them Hebrew could have had only an indirect and incidental influence. But with all his simplicity and Oriental tone of diction, the author understands and observes very well the rules of Greek syntax, and even in imitating Hebrew expressions proceeds judiciously (Lücke S. 447). Besides, examples analogous to many of these irregularities occur in the Sept., and even in Greek authors; though certainly not in such thick succession as in the Revelation. In reference to particulars we remark:

Rev. ii. 20 is probably to be construed thus: *ὅτι ἀφεῖς τὴν γυναῖκά σου Ἰεζάβελ· ἡ λέγουσα ἑαυτὴν προφήτιν καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ* etc. *who, while she pretends to be a prophetess, teaches and seduces* etc. The blending of two constructions explains vii. 9 *εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολλὸς . . . ἐστῶτες ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου . . . περιβεβλημένους* (where the writer, in using the Nom. had *ἰδοὺ*, and in using the Acc. *περιβ.* had *εἶδον*, in his mind, and blended both constructions together, cf. iv. 4; xiv. 14; Judith x. 7; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 32).¹ In Rev. v. 11 f. *ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἀγγέλων* 558 *. . . καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν μυριάδες μυριάδων . . . λέγοντες*, the last word does not refer to *μυριάδες* but to *ἄγγελοι* (as the words *καὶ ἦν . . . μυρ.* are to be considered parenthetical), as if the writer had commenced *φωνὴν ἐπήραν ἄγγελοι* etc. (Similar are Thuc. 7, 42 *τοῖς Συρακουσίοις . . . κατάπληξιν οὐκ ὀλίγη ἐγένετο . . . ὁρῶντες*, Achill. Tat. 6, 13 *πειρατήριον ταῦτα εἶναι σοι δοκεῖ . . . ἄνδρα τοιοῦτον λαβοῦσα*, Plat. Phaed. p. 81 a. *οὐκοῦν οὕτω μὲν* 474 *ἔχουσα εἰς τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτῇ τὸ ἀεὶδὲς ἀπέρχεται τὸ θεῖον τε . . . οἱ αὖ αὖ ἀφικομένη ὑπάρχει αὐτῇ εὐδαίμονι εἶναι, πλάνης . . . ἀπηλλαγμένη, ὥσπερ δὲ λέγεται κατὰ τῶν μεμνημένων, ὥς ἀληθῶς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον μετὰ θεῶν διαγούσα*, instead of *διαγούση*.) Elsewhere we 499 find *λέγων, λέγοντες* iv. 1; ix. 13 sq.; xi. 15 with *φωνή, φωναί* etc., the ^{7th ed.} reference being to the speakers themselves. *Λέγων* is even used

¹ In Rev. xiv. 14 *εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ νεφέλη λευκὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν νεφέλην καθήμενος ὅμοιος υἱὸ ἀνθρώπου, ἔχων* etc., probably *καθήμενος* is not the Acc. Masc., but the Neuter used substantively: on the cloud something like unto a human being etc. Afterwards the construction immediately passes into the Masculine.

quite absolutely xi. 1 ; xiv. 7 ; xix. 6, as in the Sept. corresponding to $\tau\epsilon\kappa\lambda$ Gen. xv. 1 ; xxii. 20 ; xxxviii. 13 ; xlv. 16 ; xlviii. 2 ; Exod. v. 14 ; Josh. x. 17 ; Judges xvi. 2 ; 1 Sam. xv. 12 ; 1 Kings xii. 10, (and even Rev. v. 12 might be so taken). The anomalous apposition (§ 59, 8 b.) in Rev. iii. 12 appears more strange: $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$, $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta\varsigma$ $\text{'}\text{Ιερ.}$, η $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$. . . $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon$ (where, however, η $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ etc., as it cannot well be taken for a Nominat. tituli, interrupts the structure as a significant parenthesis, as if for $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ η $\kappa\alpha\tau.$); and that also in xiv. 12 $\omega\delta\epsilon$ $\upsilon\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\eta$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omega\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$. $\omicron\iota$ $\tau\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ etc. (i. 5), where there is an abrupt transition to a new sentence, somewhat as in Jas. iii. 8 $\tau\eta\nu$ $\gamma\lambda\omega\varsigma\sigma\alpha\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$ $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$, $\mu\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta$ $\iota\omega\upsilon$ $\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\eta\phi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\nu$. Likewise in Rev. viii. 9 $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\omicron$ $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\nu$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\eta$ $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, ix. 14 ; xvi. 3 probably the apposition is purposely inserted in an independent form ; see besides xx. 2. In Rev. xxi. 11 f. there is a repeated change of construction : first we find $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ regularly construed with $\tau\eta\nu$ $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\nu$ vs. 10 ; then follows $\acute{o}$ $\phi\omega\sigma\tau\eta\rho$ etc., as an independent parenthetical clause ; vs. 12 reverts to $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$, but the attributive forms part of a new sentence, $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ etc. Cf. Cic. Brut. 35 Q. Catulus non antiquo more sed hoc nostro . . . eruditus ; multae literae, summa . . . comitas etc. On the combination of two constructions, each of which is allowable, in xviii. 12 f. ; xix. 12, see § 63 II. 1. That in xvii. 14 [?] is less harsh. In i. 5 f. $\tau\omicron\phi$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\omega\nu\tau\iota$ etc. is connected with $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\phi$ η $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ etc. ; the author, however, instead of writing $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ etc., inserts this thought as an independent clause. The connection of two genders in xiv. 19 we noticed above, no. 4 b. Still more singular is the construction in xi. 4 $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\alpha\iota$ $\delta\upsilon\omicron$ $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\iota$ $\delta\upsilon\omicron$ $\lambda\upsilon\chi\eta\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$ is manifestly a correction), v. 6 559 (iv. 8 ; xiv. 1 var.) ; the attributives, however, are construed ad sensum, since the substantives denote living creatures of the masculine gender. As to i. 4 see p. 68.

(Inaccuracies of a different kind have been occasionally noticed in the previous part of this Grammar. With $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\omega\iota$ p. 227, may be classed xix. 5 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ $\tau\omicron\phi$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}$. The conjunction $\text{'}\iota\alpha$ is frequently in good Codd. — p. 289 sq. — construed with the Indic. Present, xiii. 17 ; xx. 8.)

§ 60. CONNECTION OF SENTENCES: PERIODS.¹

500

7th ed.

1. In continued discourse, connection between propositions is the rule; want of connection (asyndeton), the exception. The latter is sometimes grammatical, and sometimes rhetorical. 475 8th ed.

a. Absence of grammatical connection occurs not only with sentences which begin new (i.e. the larger) sections, the commencement of which the want of connection is intended to indicate, as in Rom. ix. 1; x. 1; xiii. 1; Gal. iii. 1; iv. 21; vi. 1; Eph. vi. 1, 5, 10; Phil. iv. 1, 4; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 14; v. 1; vi. 1, 3; 2 Tim. ii. 14; iv. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 1; 1 Jno. ii. 1; iv. 1 f.; but also in uninterrupted discourse in the case of individual sentences, sometimes in narration where mere sequence passes for chronological connection, sometimes in the didactic style, particularly with injunctions, maxims and the like, which, although running on one common thread of discourse, yet present themselves as individually independent. The former class are of most frequent occurrence in John, and constitute one of the peculiarities of that writer's style, cf. the oft-recurring λέγει or εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ i. 38, 40, 42, 44, 46 f. 49, 52; ii. 4 f. 7, 8; iii. 3; iv. 7, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26, 34, 50; i. 26, 49 f.; ii. 19; iii. 3, 5, 9, 10, iv. 13, 17; though it is not to be denied that by asyndeton (cf. xx. 26; xxi. 3), especially where it runs through several verses, the narration gains much in liveliness and impressiveness (as it is often accompanied with the praesens historicus), Jno. iii. 3-5; iv. 9-11, 15-17; v. 6-8; xx. 14-18, and the grammatical asyndeton is combined with the rhetorical.

Didactic asyndeton occurs in the sermon on the mount, Matt. v. vi. and vii., also in James, but most frequently in John (in Christ's discourses and in the 1st Epistle). The discourse incessantly begins anew, as it were; and in translating, it is unjustifiable to insert a connecting particle. Cf. Jno. ii. 7; iii. 30-33; v. 43, 45; vii. 17, 18; x. 3, 4, 17 f.; xv. 2-24; 1 Jno. i. 6, 8-10; ii. 4, 6, 9 f. 15, 18 f.; iii. 1 f. 4-10, 18-20; iv. 4-10, 12; v. 1 f. 5 f. 9 f. 12, 16-19; Jas. i. 16-18; iv. 7-10; v. 1-6, 8-10; Rom. xii. 9, 14, 16, 21; 1 Tim. iv. 11-16; v. 14, 22-24; Matt. x. 8.

2. b. *Rhetorical* asyndeton, of which even Longinus 19; Gregor. Cor. in Walz rhet. graeci VII. II. 1211; Quintil. institut. 9, 3, 50 sq. treat, and which is correctly classed among rhetorical figures

¹ Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, 8. 116 f.

(Glassii philol. sacra I. 512 sq. ; Bauer, rhetor. Paull. II. 591 sqq. ; 501 cf. Hand, lat. Styl. p. 302),¹ is naturally found more frequently in 7th ed. the epistles than in the historical books of the N. T., but has not always been considered by expositors from the right point of view. Since it produces in general a sharp and rapid advance in the discourse, it gives to the style liveliness and force. The following 476 different sorts of rhetorical asyndeton (Bhdy. S. 448 ; Kühner II. 4th ed. 459 f.) between sentences (for as to asyndeton within a sentence, see § 58, 7) may be distinguished. The connecting particles are omitted,

a) When in impassioned discourse a series of parallel clauses are annexed to each other ; particularly in a climax (Reiz and Lehmann on Lucian v. hist. 2 § 35), where the repetition of the connective would make the discourse drag. Mark iv. 39 *σώπα, πεφίμωσο*, 1 Cor. iv. 8 *ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ· ἤδη ἐπλουτίσατε, χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε*, xiii. 4-8 ; xiv. 26 ; 1 Thess. v. 14 ; 1 Pet. ii. 17 ; 1 Tim. iii. 16 ; 2 Cor. vii. 2 ; Jas. v. 6 ; 1 Pet. v. 10 etc. Similar is Demosth. Phil. 4, p. 54 a. ; Pantaen. 626 a. ; Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 38 ; Weber, Demosth. p. 363.

b) In antitheses, where the force of the contrast is thus made to strike the reader more pointedly : 1 Cor. xv. 43 f. *σπείρεται ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ, σπείρεται ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δυνάμει, σπείρ. σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρ. σῶμα πνευματικόν*, Jas. i. 19 *πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκούσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι*, cf. further, Mark xvi. 6 ; Jno. iv. 22 ; vi. 63 ; viii. 41, Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 141 and Plat. Protag. p. 52. So, in general, in the counterpoising of sentences, as Acts xxv. 12 *καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι, ἐπὶ καίσαρα πορεύσῃ*, cf. Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 464.

561 c) Especially when a reason or explanation is subjoined to a statement (Krii. p. 223), or an application or exhortation is deduced from what has been said (Stallb. Plat. Alcib. 2 p. 319), Rev. xxii. 10 *μὴ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς ἐστιν*, Jno. iv. 24 ; viii. 18 ; xvii. 17 ; Rom. vi. 9 ; 1 Cor. vii. 4, 15 ; 2 Cor. xii. 11 ; Rev. xvi. 6, 15 ; 1 Pet. v. 8 ; 2 Pet. ii. 16 (Rev. xiv. 5 var.) ; Heb. iii. 12 *βλέπετε* (cf. vss. 7-11) *μήποτε ἔσται ἐν τινὶ ὑμῶν καρδιά πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας*, 1 Cor. vi. 18 ; v. 7, 13 ; vii. 23 ; 2 Cor. xi. 30 (see Mey.) ; Jno. xii. 35.

¹ See *Dissen* 2 excurs. to the Gotha ed. of Pindar ; also *Hm.* in *Jahn's Jahrb.* I. 54 ff. ; further *Nägelsbach's* Notes on the Iliad, p. 266 ff. As to Latin, cf. *Ramshorn*, S. 514 f. For the Hebrew, many examples (which, indeed, require sifting) are given by *Nolde*, Concordant. particul. p. 313 sqq.

As a distinct species of *asyndeton* that construction deserves notice, which, after a declaration, appends a discussion of it by repeating the substantive without *καί*, as in *Jno. x. 11 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός· ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων*, *xv. 13*; *1 Cor. viii. 2*. In such passages we need only supply in thought a *ὅτι* (*γάρ*) or *οὖν* (*ὥστε*), in order to feel how the expression would thus be weakened, cf. *Lys. in Nicomach. 23*; *Aesch. Ctesiph. 48* (*Kritz, Sallust. I. 184*). Lastly, the amplification of a thought is not unfrequently introduced *asyndetically*, as ^{7th ed.} in *Heb. xi. 3*.

Clauses appended *ἀσυνδέτως*, the expositors, in accordance with a prevalent impropriety, are fond of bringing into connection with what precedes by the insertion of particles, and thus the rhetorical effect of the omission of the conjunction is entirely overlooked, e.g. *1 Cor. iii. 17*; *vii. 23*; *Jas. v. 3*, see *Pott in loc.* With similar impropriety the copyists have often inserted a connective.

3. Sentences are connected with each other most simply by the copulative particles *καί* and *τε* (negatively by *οὐδέ*), which denote nothing beyond mere annexation (see § 53). Hence in historical style, according to Oriental simplicity, the transition from one fact to another is often made by them, — by *καί* in the Gospels and the Acts, *τε* (*Mdv. S. 212*) being used almost exclusively in Acts; cf. *477 καί Matt. iv. 23–25*; *vii. 25*; *viii. 23–25*; *ix. 1–4*; *xiii. 53–58*; ^{6th ed.} *Mark i. 13*; *ii. 1 f.*; *Jno. ii. 7 f. 13–16*; *iii. 22*; *iv. 27*; *v. 9*; *Acts ii. 1–4*; *xii. 7–9, 24–26*; *τε Acts xii. 6, 12, 17*; *xiii. 4, 46, 50, 52*; *xiv. 11–13, 21*; *xv. 4, 6*; *xvi. 23, 34*; *xvii. 26*; *xviii. 4, 26*; *xix. 2 f. 6, 11*; *xx. 3, 7*; *xxv. 2*; *xxvii. 3, 8, 29*; *xxviii. 2.*¹ In particular, after a specification of time in an independent clause the event is annexed by *καί*, as in *Mark xv. 25 ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν*, *Jno. xi. 55 ἦν ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα καὶ ἀνέβησαν πολλοί*, *iv. 35* etc. (cf. § 53, 3). With the Greeks this became an established form when the specification of time was to be made prominent, see *Mdv. 213 f.*

Narration is continued, however, still more regularly by means of the well-defined connecting particles *δέ* and *οὖν* (see § 53). ⁵⁶² These, since the first adds something other, different, new, and the second indicates the sequence, are in a loose application peculiarly adapted to the historical style. Hence the N. T. writers, by an

¹ What *Rost, S. 723 f.*, says of this *τε* connecting clauses in Attic prose scarcely finds corroboration in Luke.

interchange of *καί*, *δέ*, *οὖν*, imparted to their narration a certain variety, which even in the Gospels veiled the Hebraistic complexion. Cf. Jno. ii. 1 (*καί* twice); 2 (*δέ*); 3 (*καί*); 8 (*καί*), 8 f. (*δέ*); iv. 4 (*δέ*); 5 (*οὖν*); 6 (*δέ* and *οὖν*); 39 (*δέ*); 40 (*οὖν*); 41 (*καί*); 42 (*τε*); Acts xii. 1–3 (*δέ* four times); 5_ο (*οὖν* and *δέ*); 6 (*δέ*); 7 (*καί* twice and *δέ*); 8 (*δέ* twice and *καί*); 9 (*καί* twice and *δέ*); 10 (*καί* twice and *δέ*); 11 (*καί*); 12 (*τε*); 13 (*δέ*); 14 (*καί* and *δέ*); 15 (*δέ* three times); 16 (*δέ* twice); 17 (*δέ*, *τε*, and *καί*); 18 (*δέ*); 19 (*δέ* and *καί*); 20 (*δέ* twice); 21, 22 (*δέ*); 23 (*δέ* and *καί*); 24 f. (*δέ*); xxv. 1 (*οὖν*); 2 (*τε*); 4, 5 (*οὖν*); 6, 7 (*δέ*), etc.

Not much more characteristic, yet aiming at greater diversity, is the 503 connection, in the historical style, effected by *τότε* (especially in Matt.), 7th ed. *μετὰ τοῦτο* or *ταῦτα* (especially in John and Luke), *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις* etc. (in isolated cases *εἴτα*).

The *polysyndeton* between clauses not purely narrative is designed to give them prominence as individual portions of a compound sentence, e.g. Jno. x. 3 *τούτῳ δὲ θυμωρὸς ἀνοίγει καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα φωνεῖ κατ' ὄνομα καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτά* vss. 9, 12; cf. Acts xiii. 36; xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff.

4. The connection of sentences is more close when it is based on a contrast: either in general, when two sentences are joined together, like an arsis and thesis, by *μέν* . . . *δέ* (Mdv. 215) or *καί* . . . *καί* (Mdv. 212), negatively by *οὔτε* . . . *οὔτε*, as Acts xxii. 9 *τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθέασαντο, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν*, xxiii. 8; xxv. 11; i. 5 (cf. § 53, 7); Mark ix. 13 *καὶ Ἠλίας ἐλήλυθεν καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον*, Jno. ix. 37 see § 53, 4; or when an affirmative sentence is opposed to a negative, or vice versa, as Jno. iii. 17 *οὐκ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα 478 σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος*, Rom. ix. 1 *ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι*, 6th ed. cf. § 55, 8.

To this form of expression (antithesis) are likewise to be referred,

a. Comparative sentences, as Matt. xii. 40 *ὥς περ ἦν Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας κ. τρεῖς νύκτας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τ. γῆς*, Matt. v. 48 *ἔσεσθε ὑμεῖς τέλειοι, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν τέλειός ἐστιν*, Jno. iii. 14 *καθὼς Μωϋσῆς ὕψωσεν . . . οὕτως ὕψωθῆναι δεῖ*, Luke vi. 31 *καθὼς θέλετε, ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι . . . καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως*.

563 b. Temporal sentences (see § 53, 8), as Luke i. 23 *ὥς ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι . . . ἀπῆλθεν*, Acts xxvii. 1; Jno. iv. 1; Matt. xvii. 25 *ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν . . . προσέφθασεν*, vi. 2 *ὅταν οὖν ποιῇς ἐλεημοσύνην, μὴ σαλπίσῃς ἔμπροσθέν σου*, etc.

c. Even conditional sentences (§ 53, 8) 1 Cor. ix. 17 *εἰ ἐκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω, μισθὸν ἔχω*, Luke vii. 39 *εἰ ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκει ἂν*, Jno. vii. 17 *ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται* etc. That these also are properly to be referred to this head, is apparent from the structure, elsewhere examined, that occurs in Jas. v. 13 *κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν, προσευχέσθω*, where the conditional clause makes its appearance as independent: *some one among you is afflicted* (I suppose the case), *let him pray*; 1 Cor. vii. 21 *δοῦλος ἐκλήθης, μή σοι μελέτω*, cf. Jas. ii. 19 f.; Mdv. 224. Here *εἰ* has by some been unwarrantably supplied; and it is equally inadmissible to regard the first clause as interrogative, see above, p. 285; cf. Bhdy. 385; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 284 sq. So in Latin Terent. Eunuch. 2, 2, 21 *negat quis, nego*; *ait, ajo*. Heind. Horat. serm. 1, 1, 45; Kritz, Sall. II. 349.

5. In the cases just adduced a. — c. (as well as in causal sentences) a protasis and apodosis are contrasted (Luke i. 1; v. 4; Matt. iv. 3; v. 13; Heb. ii. 14, etc.), though the beginning of the latter is not in most cases specially marked, as it is in German by *so* — (hence sometimes it is doubtful where the apodosis begins, ^{7th ed.} as in Jas. iii. 3 f.; iv. 15, etc.); for when *οὕτως* seems to be employed for this purpose, or when *εἶτα, τότε*, and in hypothetical constructions *ἀλλὰ, δέ* (Jacobs, Ael. anim. p. 27 sq. praef.), *ἄρα* (*οὖν*? see § 63), is put before the apodosis, as in Mark xiii. 14; Matt. xii. 28; Jno. vii. 10; xi. 6; xii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23; xv. 54; xvi. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. v. 3, etc., it is intended to give prominence to the apodosis, — by *οὕτως* in particular to refer again to the circumstances expressed in the protasis.

It is only in comparative sentences that

a. A *οὕτως* or *καί* before the apodosis corresponds often to the *ὡς, ὥσπερ, καθὼς* of the protasis, Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 7; Matt. xii. 40; Jno. v. 21; xv. 4, 9; xx. 21 (*οὕτως* is the most regular correlate of *ὥσπερ*). *Οὕτως* after a conditional clause was formerly thought to be purely pleonastic. But in Rev. xi. 5 *οὕτως* means *hoc modo* (see the sentence preceding), and in 1 Thess. iv. 14 it refers to the similarity of the lot of believers to that of Christ (*ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη*); and these instances have no resemblance to those adduced by Mtth. 1457. (Still less is *οὕτως* ⁵⁶⁴ redundant after participles in Jno. iv. 6; Acts xx. 11; see § 65, 9.) ⁴⁷⁹ In the case of grouping of protasis and apodosis, the protasis is usually repeated in a distinct form after the apodosis, so as to produce apparently a double apodosis, as in Rev. ii. 5 *μετανόησον*.

εἰ δὲ μὴ (μετανοεῖς), ἔρχομαι σοι ταχύ . . . , ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσῃς, where the length of the sentence occasioned the repetition. This, however, is probably not the case in Matt. v. 18, see § 65, 6, p. 612.

6. Objective, consecutive, final, and causal sentences are conceived as distinctly dependent on, and consequently subordinate to, a leading clause, and are accordingly presented in the form of dependent sentences introduced respectively by ὅτι, ὥς, by ὥστε, ὥς (not ἵνα, see § 53, 10, 6 p. 457 sq.) also οὖν, ἄρα, by ἵνα or ὅπως, by γάρ, ὅτι etc. see § 53 (where the relation of grammatical dependence is sometimes expressed also by the indirect moods of the verb). Causal are akin to objective sentences; hence both are introduced by ὅτι (*quod*), signifying either *because* or *that*. Εἰ (like the Latin *si*) is so used apparently in one class of cases, after verbs denoting an affection of the mind, where the objective ὅτι might have been expected (Hoogeveen, *doctr. partic.* ed. Schütz, p. 228 sq.; Jacob, *Lucian. Toxar.* p. 52; *Mdv.* 225), e.g. Mark xv. 44 ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκεν miratus est si jam mortuus fuerit, 1 Jno. iii. 13 μὴ θαυμάζετε, εἰ μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος cf. Fr. Marc. p. 702. But ὅτι is employed when the occasion of surprise (grief etc.) is a positive matter of fact, εἰ when it hovers before the speaker's mind as merely a possibility, seems to him doubtful, or at least is to be represented as doubtful: marvel not, if the world hate you (Weber, *Demosth.* p. 535; *Mth.* 1474 f.; Rost 622). Similar is Acts xxvi. 8. Sometimes modesty or diffidence has led to the selection of this latter form of expression, 505 just as we sometimes hear: he begged him if he would not promise 7th ed. (Germ. er bat ihn, *ob* u.s.w.). Cf. with this Acts viii. 22.

The affinity of objective and relative sentences is illustrated in Acts xiv. 27 ἀνγγέλλον, ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν etc.

7. a. Relative sentences still more distinctly assume a dependent character when they are of an appositive nature, whether more or less requisite to complete the sentence; as, Matt. ii. 9 ὁ ἀστήρ, ὃν εἶδον, προσήγεν αὐτούς, Rom. v. 14 Ἀδάμ, ὃς ἐστὶ τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, 1 Cor. i. 30 Χριστῷ, ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν etc., Acts i. 2; xv. 10. But the form of a relative clause is adopted in two other cases: a. when the discourse, particularly a narration, is continued by ὃς and that is resolvable into καὶ οὗτος, as in Acts xiii. 43 ἡκολούθησαν πολλοί . . . τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ, οἵτινες προσλαλοῦντες ἐπειθον αὐτούς etc., Acts xvi. 24 ἐβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν 565 παραγγέλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι . . . ὃς παραγγέλλαν τοιαύτην etc.,

Luke x. 30; Acts iii. 3; xiii. 31; xiv. 9; xvi. 14, 16; xvii. 10; xix. 25; xxi. 4; xxii. 4; xxiii. 14; xxviii. 23; β . when the Subject or Predicate is a relative sentence, e.g. Acts xiii. 25 *ἔρχεται, οὗ 480 οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημα λῦσαι*, vs. 48 *ἐπίστευσαν, ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, vs. 37; Jno. xi. 3 *ὃν φιλεῖς, ἀσθενεῖ*, Matt. x. 27; xxiii. 12; Jno. i. 46; iii. 34; xv. 7; 1 Jno. ii. 5; iv. 6; Acts xiii. 37; Rom. viii. 25. In this case the relative clause is often placed before the principal, as in Jno. iii. 34; xiii. 7; 1 Jno. iii. 17; Acts x. 15; Rom. viii. 25, or there is a reference from the latter to the relative clause by means of a demonstrative, as in Matt. v. 19; Luke ix. 26; Jno. v. 19; 1 Jno. ii. 5.

Not unfrequently several relative clauses are combined, as in 1 Pet. iii. 19–22, — either as co-ordinate, as in Acts xiv. 15 f.; i. 2 f.; iii. 2 f.; xxvii. 23; xxiv. 6, 8 (Tdf.), or as subordinate one to another, as in Acts xiii. 31 (*Ἰησοῦς*) *ὃς ὥφθη τοῖς συναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ . . . οἵτινες νῦν εἰσὶν μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ* etc. xiv. 15 f.; xxvi. 7; Rom. i. 2, 5, 6.

b. Indirect interrogative sentences (which in classic Greek were marked by the special form of the interrogatives *ὅστις, ὁποῖος, ὁπόσος* etc.), as Jno. vi. 64 *ᾗδει τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες*, Matt. x. 11 *ἐξετάσατε τίς ἄξιός ἐστιν*, Jno. iii. 8 *οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται κ. ποῦ ὑπάγει*, Acts x. 18 *ἐπυνθάνετο εἰ Σίμων ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται*, Luke xxii. 23 *ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων πράσσειν*, Acts xxv. 20 *ἀπορούμενος ἐγὼ . . . ἔλεγον, εἰ βούλοιο πορεύεσθαι* etc. Cf. on this Schleiermacher, Hermen. S. 131.

8. We have thus far spoken of the connection of sentences with each other by certain single connective words, among which, speaking somewhat loosely, the relatives also may be reckoned; but connection may also be effected by means of forms of inflection, 508 especially the Infinitive and the Participle, in such a manner as to render grammatically the subordinate clauses constituent parts of the principal clause :

a. 1 Cor. xvi. 3 *τούτους πέμψω ἀπενεγκεῖν τὴν χάριν (ἵνα ἀπενέγκωσι)*, Mark iv. 8 *ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν*, Acts xxvi. 16 *εἰς τοῦτο ὥφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε*, Phil. i. 7 *διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (ὅτι ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ κ. ἔχω)*, Acts xviii. 2; xxvii. 9; xix. 1 *ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπολλῶ εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ*, xx. 1 *μετὰ τὸ παύσασθαι τὸν θόρυβον . . . ὁ Παῦλος ἐξῆλθεν*. Especially do Infinitives with prepositions serve to give compactness and roundness to sentences, and so too the Acc. with the Inf. which

usually represents an objective clause; as, Heb. vi. 11 *ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν*, 1 Tim. ii. 8 *βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι ἄνδρας* etc. § 44, 3, p. 321.

- 566 b. 2 Cor. vii. 1 *ταύτας ἔχοντες ἐπαγγελίας καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτούς*, Luke iv. 35; Acts xxv. 13 *κατήντησαν ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*, Acts xxv. 1 *Φῆστος ἐπιβὰς τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ . . . ἀνέβη*, Luke iv. 2 *ἤγετο ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ πειραζόμενος*, Acts xii. 16 *ἐπέμενε κρούων* (§ 45, 4). Particularly are participles in the Gen. abs. employed thus to denote accessory circumstances, local or temporal (§ 30 note, p. 207), e.g. Acts xxv. 13 *ἡμερῶν διαγενομένων τινῶν Ἀγρίππας καὶ Βερνίκη κατήντησαν*, x. 9 *ἐκείνων τῇ πόλει ἐγγιζόντων ἀνέβη Πέτρος*, Luke iv. 40 *δύνοντος τοῦ ἡλίου πάντες . . . ἤγαγον*, ix. 42 *ἔτι προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον*, Mark xiv. 3 *καὶ ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ*, ἦλθεν γυνή etc. And this gradually became so usual a mode of expression, that it was employed even when the subject was the same as that of the principal clause, see p. 208. Besides, one and the same principal sentence frequently contains several participial constructions co-ordinate or subordinate one to another, by which means the structure of the sentence is rendered more organic, e.g. Acts xii. 25 *Βαρνάβας καὶ Σαῦλος ὑπέστρεψαν ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ, πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ Ἰωάννην*, xvi. 27 *ἔξυπνος γενόμενος ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ καὶ ἰδὼν ἀνεφγμένας τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς, σπασάμενος μάχαιραν ἤμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν, νομίζων ἐκπεφευγέναι τοὺς δεσμίους*, xxiii. 27 *τὸν ἄνδρα τούτον συλλημφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ μέλλοντα ἀναιρεῖσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐπιστάς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι ἐξειλάμην αὐτόν, μαθὼν* etc. Acts xiv. 19; xviii. 22 f.; xxv. 6 f.; 2 Tim. i. 4; Tit. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xi. 4; Luke vii. 37 f.

Hence in general it must be noticed, that in this manner compound sentences receive not merely greater variety, but also a greater degree of periodic compactness. This latter result is effected still more decidedly by the blending of two independent propositions into one, *Attraction* (§ 66), for which purpose relatives possess very extensive aptitude (§ 24). Attraction, too, is itself very diversified, and occurs even in the N. T. in many forms, from 507 the simple (as in Luke v. 9 *ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων, ἧ συνέλαβον*, 7th ed. Acts iv. 13 *ἐπεγίνωσκον αὐτοὺς ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν*) to the complex, as in Rom. iii. 8 *τί ἔτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; καὶ μὴ, καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασὶν τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά, ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ;*

Note. In contrast with this intertwining of clauses stands the practice of forming a proposition where a simple Infinitive would have sufficed; as, Mark xiv. 21 *καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος*, 1 Jno. v. 2 *ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν, ὅτι . . . , ὅταν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν* (ii. 3), Acts xxvii. 42 *τῶν στρατιωτῶν βουλὴ ἐγένετο, ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνουσιν* (on the other 567 hand, vs. 12), Rev. xix. 8. This mode of expression is not always adopted from a love of amplification (a peculiarity of the later language), but is employed sometimes to give more forcible prominence, and sometimes to attain a more flexible construction.

9. By these various means of connection, the style of the N. T. is shaped into an organic structure which is by no means destitute of variety, though it is inferior in this respect to the style of Greek authors. In this way are constructed periods even of considerable length, particularly in Luke (and especially in the Acts), e.g. Luke i. 1-3; Acts xii. 13 f.; xv. 24-26; xvii. 24 f.; xx. 9, 20 f.; xxiii. 10; xxvi. 10-14, 16-18; Rom. i. 1-7; 1 Pet. iii. 18-22; Heb. ii. 2-4; 2 Pet. i. 2-7. At the same time it must be admitted that, after the beginning of a long period has been made, the thread of the arrangement is frequently broken, and the sentence terminates in some kind of anacoluthon or remains quite unfinished Rom. iii. 8; xii. 6-8; xvi. 25 f. 27; Mark vi. 8 f.; Gal. ii. 4 f.; 2 Pet. ii. 4-8; 2 Thess. ii. 3 f.; see § 63, or at least is commenced anew 2 Pet. ii. 5 sq.; Eph. v. 27; Jno. viii. 53; Rev. ii. 2, 9. The N. T. writers, 482 further, have desisted from one mode of constructing ramified sentences, in that they regularly do not incorporate quotations, though but of small extent, in an indirect form, but express them directly, and without introducing them always by *ὅτι* as an external connective or by *λέγων*, as in Matt. ix. 18; xxvi. 72; Mark xi. 32; Luke v. 12; Jno. i. 20; xxi. 17; Gal. i. 23; Acts iii. 22; v. 23, etc. They often, even when they begin with an indirect quotation of others' words, pass over very soon into the oratio directa, as in Luke v. 14; Acts i. 4; xxiii. 22; see § 63. The same takes place in particular after verbs of requesting; in which case instead of subjoining the request indirectly, by means of an Inf. or a clause with *ἵνα* (§ 44, 8), the precise words of the petitioner are stated, as in Luke xiv. 18 *ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρηγημένον*, vs. 19; v. 12; Jno. iv. 31; ix. 2; Phil. iv. 8; Acts ii. 40; xvi. 15; xxi. 39; Matt. viii. 31; xviii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 16. However, what the style loses thus in compactness, it gains on the other hand in animation and vividness. Further, see Schleiermacher, Herm. 131.

Note. It is interesting to notice, in parallel sections, especially in the

first three gospels, the variety as respects the structure and connection of sentences. Luke will be found by such comparison invariably the most expert writer, and more careful than the others also in the selection of his words; (he prefers, for instance, idiomatic expressions, *verba composita* and *decomposita*). This subject, however, belongs to N. T. *Stylistics*.

568 § 61. POSITION OF WORDS AND CLAUSES, ESPECIALLY WHEN
IRREGULAR (HYPERBATON).

1. The arrangement of the individual words of a sentence is, in general, determined by the order in which the conceptions are formed, and by the specific relation which the different parts of the sentence (as groups of words) bear to each other. This relation requires, for instance, that the adjective should regularly be placed in immediate contact with its substantive, the adverb with its verb or adjective, the Genitive with its governing noun, the preposition with its case, and one member of an antithesis with the other. In particulars, however, the connection of a clause with what precedes (cf. Heb. xi. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 6; Col. ii. 9; Phil. iv. 10), the greater (rhetorical) emphasis to be given to a word, even to a greater or less degree the requirements of euphony, regulate the respective position of the words. Sometimes, however, the arrangement depends on the nature or the conventional importance of the ideas (e.g. *terra marique*, etc.). It is not necessary that the word to be emphasized should be placed at the commencement of the clause; it may even stand at the end (see e.g. Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 74), and in any case in that position which from the nature of the sentence gives it the most striking prominence. For example, intentional connection with what precedes causes a relative pronoun, even in an oblique case, usually to begin the clause etc. The position of words is determined therefore, by the laws of the succession of thought and by rhetorical aims (Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 131). And although these leave great latitude to the spontaneous mental movements of the writer, and are never felt by the practised author as trammels; yet just because the arrangement of words decidedly serves logical and rhetorical purposes, only a small part of it usually becomes so habitual with an individual writer that it can be considered as a prominent characteristic of his style.¹

¹ No very thorough treatise is known to me on the arrangement of words in Greek. Kühner's attempt, however, to vindicate for this subject (under the name of *Topik*) its

2. The arrangement of words in the N. T. is in the main determined by the same principles as in the Greek prose authors, for these principles are but to a very small extent confined to any particular nation. It must be remarked, however, that

a. The arrangement of words is bolder and more diversified in the didactic writings, particularly those of Paul, than in the historical books; since in the former the rhetorical element is more influential, while in the (synoptical) gospels the Hebraistic type of arrangement predominates.

b. Especially in the narrative style, a wide separation of the two principal parts of a sentence, the Subject and the verb (Predicate), is avoided; and, in accordance with the Hebrew mode of expression, sometimes the verb is advanced nearer to the Subject, sometimes, when the Subject is complex, only the principal Subject precedes the verb, and the others follow (see § 58, 6), lest the attention should be kept too long in suspense. Relative clauses, too, are if possible so placed as to be introduced only after the full enunciation of the principal clause. On the whole, the arrangement of words in the N. T. is simple and free from all affectation, as well as from stiffness or monotony. Gersdorf, in his well-known work, has professed to point out numerous peculiarities of individual N. T. writers; but on strict examination it will be found that a) he has not duly investigated the several particulars on which the arrangement of words is in every case dependent; and b) under the impression that it might become the invariable usage of a writer to place e.g. the adverb *before* or *after* the verb, he has propounded and partly executed a species of critical inquiry that merits the charge of prejudgment. A philosophical work on this subject would be a great acquisition to verbal criticism.

It is not a matter of indifference whether a writer employs τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ or τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. § 20, 1), or, without the articles, πνεῦμα θεοῦ or θεοῦ πν. Every individual passage of the N. T. must be elucidated according to its respective stylistic conformation. To lose sight

due place in grammar deserves thanks (ii. 622 ff.); *Mdv.* also has collected some observations on the subject (Syntax, S. 258 ff.). In regard to Latin, special inquiries were previously instituted in connection with the doctrine of sound, and the subject is ably though briefly handled by *Zumpt*, *Grammat.* S. 626 ff.; cf. also *Hand*, *Lehrb. des lat. Stils* S. 307 ff.; *Gernhard*, *commentatt. gramm.* P. 8 (Jen. 1828. 4to.). On the ancient languages in general, see *H. Weil*, *de l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes* etc. Paris, 1844. 8vo. As respects the habitude of individual writers in the arrangement of words, *Tzschirner*, for instance, who strove after a prose rhythm, could not fail to be recognized in any one of his writings.

of this, neglecting the Codd. (as well as the ancient versions, and the more or less free quotations in the Fathers), and invariably to attribute to a writer one and the same arrangement of words, is empirical pedantry. If the adjective is *usually* placed thus: φόβος μέγας, ἔργον ἀγαθόν, or the
 570 adverb in reference to its adjective thus: χαλεπὸς λίαν, μεγάλη σφόδρα
 510 (Strabo 17, 801), the arrangement is very natural. The opposite arrange-
 7th ed. ment either aims at giving prominence to the adjectival or adverbial notion, which with many writers may be caused by an antithesis habitual to them (καλὰ ἔργα is used for the most part by Paul); or the (antithetical) nature of a particular adjectival notion may require that it should precede, like ἄλλος, εἰς, ἴδιος, etc. That ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος should occur more frequently than οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος is likewise not surprising. The latter arrangement implies an emphasis on the pronoun (*this* man, no other), which is in place only when one is speaking *δεικτικῶς* or intensively. The predominance of the latter arrangement in John (Gersdorf 444 f.) is, in the first place, by no means decided, and secondly, the reason for such arrangement may be easily perceived in all the passages in which it occurs. Ταῦτα πάντα Luke xii. 30 and πάντα ταῦτα Matt. vi. 32 are not exactly of the same import (Gersd. 447 f.): the former means *THESE THINGS all together*; the latter, *ALL these*. In the first expression, πάντα is a closer specification of ταῦτα; in the second, πάντα is pointed out demonstratively by means of ταῦτα. Πάντα ταῦτα is undoubtedly the more rare, much like *omnia haec* in Latin, yet in Matt. xxiii. 36; xxiv. 38 f.; Luke vii. 18 it is the better established reading, cf. Bengel on Matt. xxiv. 33. That the narrators when they subjoin something chronologically say ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις and the like, will not be considered by any observant reader as an arbitrary deviation from the usual sequence: ἡ πόλις ἐκείνη. To what purpose are remarks such as: πάλιν, ἐκεῖθεν etc. are placed sometimes before and sometimes after?¹ Finally, I cannot imagine how Gersdorf (S. 335) could so misjudge the place of the adjective in Matt. xiii. 27; xv. 20 as even to be inclined to correct the text. When we find in Matt. xv. 34 πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· ἐπτα καὶ ὀλίγα ἰχθύδια but in Mark viii. 7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα, the antithesis with ἐπτα required that ὀλίγα should precede; whilst in the latter passage *bread* and *fish* are contrasted: they had also in *fish* a small provision. That Paul writes in 1 Tim. v. 23 οἶνον ὀλίγον and James iii. 5 ὀλίγον (var. ἡλίκον) πῦρ, nobody probably will think strange who studies language with attention. In Jno. v. 22 τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ, πᾶσαν is very appropriately
 485 placed immediately before δέδωκε, as it belongs to it (he gave it to him not
 6th ed. in part, but wholly, 1 Cor. xii. 12), cf. also Matt. ix. 35; Rom. iii. 9; xii. 4;

¹ Even the more precise remark of *van Hengel*, Philipp. p. 201, on πάλιν as used in Paul's epistles, I cannot admit as a canon according to which critical or exegetical inquiries could implicitly be conducted. As to Phil. ii. 28 I adhere to the exposition propounded in § 45, 4 note 1 p. 346.

Acts xvi. 26; xvii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 1 (Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 40; Thuc. 7, 60 etc.). Along with the arrangement *πᾶσα ἡ πόλις* occurs also *ὁ πᾶς νόμος* Gal. v. 14, *τὸν πάντα χρόνον* Acts xx. 18; 1 Tim. i. 16 (Thuc. 4, 61; Isocr. Dem. 571 p. 1; Herod. 1, 14, 10; Stallb. Phil. 48). On the simple *precedence* of an emphatic word (Jno. vi. 57; viii. 25; ix. 31; xiii. 6; Rom. vii. 23; xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 22; xiv. 2; xv. 44; Luke ix. 20; xii. 30; xvi. 11; Heb. x. 30; Jas. iii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Pet. i. 21), no remark is necessary. Yet see under 8. The order in the apostolic benediction *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*, uniformly adhered to as it is (in 1st and 2d Pet. also), is certainly intended to point out *χάρις* as the principal and more comprehensive idea, to which *εἰρήνη* is added as a consequent. The Vocative, with or without *ὦ*, either precedes the sentence, — that is, when it expresses a cry Mark xiv. 37, or as an address is intended to rouse the attention for what follows Matt. viii. 2; xv. 28; xviii. 32; xxv. 26; Mark ix. 19; Luke viii. 48; xxiv. 25; Jno. vi. 68; xiii. 6; xxi. 15 sqq.; Acts i. 11; ii. 29; v. 35; vii. 59; ix. 13; xiii. 10; xxv. 24; Rom. ix. 20; Gal. iii. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 20, — or is intercalated into the sentence, when, that is, the attention of the person addressed is assumed, and what follows is to be referred solely to him Matt. ix. 22; xvi. 17; xx. 31; Jno. xii. 15; Acts i. 1; xxvi. 19, 24, 27; Gal. i. 11; Phil. i. 12; iii. 17; Philem. 20; 2 Pet. i. 10; Rev. xv. 4. The Vocative in this case stands after one word or several, according as they are or are not connected in sense Matt. xvi. 17; Jno. xii. 15; Rev. xv. 4, etc.; sometimes, when supplementary, it stands at the end of the sentence Luke v. 8; Jno. xiv. 9; Acts xxvi. 7.

8. The grounds of every unusual arrangement (transposition) of words, when it originates in the writer's free choice, may with greater or less distinctness be ascertained. The following cases are to be distinguished:

a. When the unusual position of the words is occasioned by *rhetorical* causes, and is consequently intentional, as in 1 Pet. ii. 7 the appositive (Weber, Demosth. p. 152) *τοῖς πιστεύουσιν* is reserved for the conclusion, because the condition *as believers, if we believe*, thus obtains greater prominence, particularly as it is brought so close to the antithetical *ἀπειθοῦσι*.¹ Cf. 1 Jno. v. 13, 16; Jno. xiii. 14; Rom. xi. 13; Heb. vi. 18 (Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 144), also Heb. vii. 4 *ὃ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων, ὁ πατριάρχης unto whom Abr. gave even a tenth, the patriarch*, xi. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 4. Other instances of the same sort are Heb. vi. 19 *ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τ. ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην* etc. x. 34; 1 Pet. i. 23; 1 Cor. xiii. 1 *ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσ-*

¹ Cf. with this Demosth. fals. leg. 204 c. *εἰμὶ τολῶν δὲ κατηγορῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγὼ τοῦτων, τοῦτων δ' οὐδ' αὖτις ἐμῶν.*

σαις τ. ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, Acts xxiv. 17; xxvi. 22. The Genitive in particular is put last, 1 Thess. i. 6; Jno. vii. 38; 1 Tim. iii. 6, etc. In giving a word *precedence* (see above, no. 2), antithesis is manifest in 1 Cor. x. 11 ταῦτα τύποι συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς etc. Luke xvi. 12; xxiii. 31; Jno. ix. 17; xxi. 21, likewise in 2 Cor. ii. 4 οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ἵνα γνῶτε, xii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 15; Acts xix. 4; Rom. xi. 31; Col. iv. 16; Gal. ii. 10 (Cic. div. 1, 40; Mil. 2 fin.; Krü. 236), as well as in 1 Cor. vi. 4 βιωτικὰ μὲν οὖν κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχητε (such postponement of ἐάν is frequent in Demosth., see Klotz, Devar. p. 484); Rom. xii. 3 ἐκάστω ὡς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως, 1 Cor. iii. 5; viii. 7; 512 Jno. xiii. 34 (Cic. off. 2, 21, 72); 2 Thess. ii. 7 μόνον ὁ κατέχων
74 ed. ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται, finally in Rom. viii. 18 οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τ. νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τ. μέλλονσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, Gal. iii. 23; Heb. x. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 22.

b. At other times we find a closer specification, which only occurred to the writer after the sentence had been arranged, 512 brought in afterwards; as, Acts xxii. 9 τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθεάσαντο, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι, iv. 33 μεγάλη δυνάμει ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, Heb. xii. 11; Jno. iv. 39; vi. 66; xii. 11; 1 Cor. 486 x. 27; Luke xix. 47; 1 Pet. i. 13; 2 Pet. iii. 2 (Acts xix. 27);
64 ed. cf. Arrian. Al. 3, 23, 1 τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας ἐν τῇ διώξει τῆς στρατιᾶς. To this head should probably be referred also Rev. vii. 17. In 2 Pet. iii. 1 ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν the words spaced out are thrust into the current of the sentence as a subjoined closer specification of διεγείρω.

c. Words which are to be joined together in sense, are placed near each other; as, Rom. ix. 21 ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τ. πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι etc., 1 Pet. ii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 11. In Eph. ii. 3 φύσει belongs to τέκνα, and accordingly has the most suitable place.

d. Sometimes the transposition is unavoidable; as, Heb. xi. 32 ἐπιλείψει γὰρ με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεὼν, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψών etc. where, since a long series of names follows with which in vs. 33 a relative clause is to be connected, no other arrangement was possible, vi. 1, 2; 1 Cor. i. 30.

e. An effort to keep unimportant words in the background, is manifest in Heb. iv. 11 ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ etc. v. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 19; Acts xxvi. 24. So perhaps in 1 Cor. v. 1 ὥστε γυναικὰ τινὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν (*that the wife one has of his*

father), Luke xviii. 18. See Weber, Demosth. pp. 139, 251. Likewise in Heb. ix. 16 ὅπου διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου, the main thought θάνατον ἀνάγκη would have been weakened if the last word had been placed anywhere else. Occasionally in the more dexterous N. T. writers the *aurium judicium* even, on which Cicero laid so much stress, may have exerted an influence, and produced a more flowing and rhythmical arrangement.

On the collocation of the same or similar words, as κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσθαι, see § 68, 1; cf. Kühner II. 628.

The antecedent position of the Predicate (e.g. in Jno. i. 1, 49 cf. vs. 47; iv. 19, 24; vi. 60; Rom. xiii. 11; 2 Pet. i. 10, 14, 19; Phil. iii. 20; ii. 11; 1 Jno. i. 10; Rev. ii. 9) is everywhere to be judged of according to the principles stated above. It is quite natural also, that, particularly in sentences having an exclamatory character, as well as in macarisms, the predicate should be placed at the beginning (the omission of the substantive verb being in such sentences the predominant usage), e.g. Matt. xxi. 9 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, xxiii. 39; Luke i. 42, 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 11 [?]; 1 Pet. i. 3; Matt. v. 3 μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, 4-11; xxiv. 46. So also regularly in forms of praise in the O. T. (אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים Gen. ix. 26; 1 Sam. xxvi. 25; 2 Sam. xviii. 28; Ps. cvi. 48, etc. 7th ed. 573 But only an empirical expositor could regard this position as an unalterable rule; for, when the subject constitutes the principle notion, especially when it is antithetical to another subject, the predicate may and must be placed after it, cf. Ps. lxxvii. 20 Sept. And so in Rom. ix. 5, if the words ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητός etc. are referred to God, the position of the words is quite appropriate, and even indispensable, — which, with many others, Harless on Eph. i. 3 has failed to see.

As to placing in particular the Genitive before the governing noun, see § 30, 3, note 4, p. 192. Careful writers avoid such arrangement if misapprehension could arise from it. Hence in Heb. vi. 2 βαπτισμῶν διδασκῆς is not instead of διδασκ. βαπτ., especially as in the other groups the position of the Genitive is in accordance with the rule. In the passages adduced by Tholuck from Thuc. and Plut. ambiguity is impossible.

4. Formerly, attention to the arrangement of words in the N. T. 487 was restricted to those cases in which parts of sentences are found separated from those words with which they belong logically (1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 7; Rom. xi. 13; Heb. ii. 9), which was denominated *Trajection*.¹ Such restriction was not so much

¹ See on such trajections in Greek, Abresch, Aristænet. p. 218; Wolf, Demosth. Lept. p. 300; Reitz, Lucian. VII. 448 Bip.; Krüger, Dion. Hal. p. 139, 318; Engelhardt, Euthyphr. p. 123 sq.

to be censured, as the almost entire neglect to inquire into the reasons which, in each particular case, gave occasion to the so-called trajection. By such (rather instinctive) reasons the N. T. writers were invariably guided. Very seldom indeed have they transposed words, either when the nature of the ideas (Quintil. instit. 9, 4, 24) suggested the arrangement of the words (Matt. vii. 7; Jno. vii. 34; Rev. xxi. 6; xxii. 13; Matt. viii. 11; Heb. xiii. 8), or in phrases where according to the nature or importance of the ideas (sometimes not without regard to ease of utterance) the order of words had been fixed conventionally. Thus: *ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες* Acts viii. 3; ix. 2, *γυναῖκες καὶ παῖδιά* or *τέκνα* Matt. xiv. 21; xv. 38; Acts xxi. 5, *ζῶντες κ. νεκροί* Acts x. 42; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5, *νύκτα κ. ἡμέραν* Acts xx. 31; xxvi. 7, *νυκτός κ. ἡμέρας* 1 Thess. ii. 9; iii. 10, *σάρξ κ. αἷμα* Matt. xvi. 17; Gal. i. 16; Jno. vi. 54, 56, *ἐσθίειν (τρώγειν) κ. πίνειν* Matt. xi. 18; Luke vii. 34; xii. 45; 1 Cor. xi. 22, 29, *βρώσις κ. πόσις* Rom. xiv. 17; 574 Col. ii. 16, *ἔργω κ. λόγῳ* Luke xxiv. 19 (Fr. Rom. III. 268), *ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ* Matt. v. 18; xi. 25; xxiv. 35; Acts iv. 24, etc. *ὁ ἥλιος κ. ἡ σελήνη* Luke xxi. 25; Rev. xxi. 23, *ἡ γῆ κ. ἡ θάλασσα* Acts iv. 24; xiv. 15; Rev. vii. 1, 3; xiv. 7, etc., *right . . . left* Matt. 514 xx. 21; xxv. 33; Mark x. 40; Luke xxiii. 33; 2 Cor. vi. 7; Rev. ^{7th ed.} x. 2, *δούλοι . . . ἐλεύθεροι* 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Eph. vi. 8, *Ἰουδαῖοι κ. Ἕλληνες* Acts xviii. 4; xix. 10; Rom. iii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 24 (cf. Rom. ii. 9 f.) and the like. Deviations from this order occur but sparingly (cases, indeed, may be conceived in which the reverse order corresponds better with the truth, cf. Rom. xiv. 9; Heusinger, Plut. educ. 2, 5); and if there is exclusive or predominant MS. authority for the opposite, it must be unhesitatingly adhered to, e.g. Eph. vi. 12 *αἷμα κ. σάρξ*, Heb. ii. 14; Matt. xxiii. 15 *ἡ θάλασσα κ. ἡ ξηρά*, Acts ix. 24 *ἡμέρας κ. νυκτός* Luke xviii. 7; Rom. xv. 18 *λόγῳ κ. ἔργῳ* (Diod. S. exc. Vat. p. 23), Col. iii. 11 *Ἕλληνας κ. Ἰουδαίους*. (Cod. D has in Matt. xiv. 21; xv. 38 [and in the latter passage Cod. Sin. also] *παῖδιά καὶ γυναῖκες*, cf. Cacs. b. gall. 2, 28; 4, 14.) In the N. T. the order *οἱ πόδες καὶ αἱ χεῖρες* seems to predominate, as in Matt. xxii. 13; Jno. xi. 44; xiii. 9; Acts xxi. 11. Only in Luke xxiv. 39 f. we find the opposite *τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας* (perhaps with reference to the fact that only the hands of persons crucified were pierced, and were therefore considered principal parts, just as Jno. mentions only the hands). In Rom. xiv. 9 the order *νεκροὶ καὶ ζῶντες* is determined by the preceding *ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν*.

The arrangement of words in the N. T. is more unrestrained, when a series of ideas is framed. For then general and special conceptions etc. are not grouped together, but the words follow one another according to some loose association of ideas, or even 488 a resemblance in sound, Rom. i. 29, 31; Col. iii. 5. See, in general, Lob. paralip. p. 62 sqq.

It is necessary to be cautious in applying to such abnormal arrangements the name of *hysteron proteron* (cf. Odyss. 12, 134 τὰς μὲν ἄρα θρέψασα τεκοῦσά τε, Thuc. 8, 66; Nitzsch on the Odyss. I. 251 f.). We remark in passing, that on Jno. i. 52 ἐγγέλους θεοῦ ἀναβαλίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας Lücke has stated the right view of the matter; and that vi. 69 πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν (cf. x. 38) must not on account of 1 Jno. iv. 16 ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν (Jno. xvii. 8) be considered as an inversion of thought, see BCrus. in loc. Likewise, in other passages of the N. T. it would be a mistake to suppose there is a *hysteron proteron*: In 1 Tim. ii. 4 πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἔλθειν the comprehensive ultimate end is first mentioned, and then the immediate (as the means of attaining the former), — (καὶ and therefore). In Acts xiv. 10, however, ἤλατο καὶ περιεπάτει is quite as possible as a matter of fact, as in 575 iii. 8 περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος. In 2 Pet. i. 9 μυωπάζων is subjoined as a more exact definition. The *hysteron proteron* which Bornem. Acts xvi. 18 has adopted from Cod. D, rests on too little authority. Further, see Wilke, Rhetor. 226.

5. f. Sometimes, however, single words were misplaced through inadvertency, or still more, because the ancients, expecting none but intelligent readers, were released from the necessity of minute accuracy. Such irregularity occurred not unfrequently in prose writers in the use of certain adverbs (Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 123), to which, from the sense, every reader could at once assign the 515 proper position, even though the author's arrangement might not be the most logical. This applies to αἰεὶ in Isocr. Paneg. 14 διετελέσαν κοινήν τὴν πόλιν παρέχοντες καὶ τοῖς ἰδικουμένοις αἰεὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπαμύνουσαν, Xen. Oec. 19, 19; Thuc. 2, 43, etc. (see Krüger, Dion. p. 252; Schaef. Demosth. II. 234); also to πολλάκις Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 93; to ἔτι Rom. v. 6 ἔτι Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν (instead of ἔτι ὄντ. ἡμ. ἀσθ.) cf. vs. 8; Plato, rep. 2, 363 d.; Achill. Tat. 5, 18 and Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 300 sqq.; lastly, to ὁμως 1 Cor. xiv. 7 ὁμως τὰ ἄφνυχα φωνὴν διδόντα . . . ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοῖς φθόργοις μὴ δῶ, πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον etc. instead of τὰ ἄφνυχα, (καίπερ) φων. διδ., ὁμως, ἐὰν μὴ etc., and Gal. iii. 15 ὁμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ instead of ὁμ. οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ (see Bengel, and my Comment. in loc.), cf. Plato, Phaed.

- 91 c. φοβείται μὴ ἡ ψυχὴ ὁμῶς καὶ θεϊότερον καὶ κάλλιον ὂν τοῦ σώματος προαπολλύηται, see Hm. and Lob. Soph. Aj. 15; Doederlein, Soph. Oed. C. p. 396; Pflugk, Eurip. Androm. p. 10 and Hel. p. 76.¹
- 489 Likewise the transposition of a negative is not altogether rare
 6th ed. in Greek authors (especially the poets, see Hm. Eurip. Hec. vs. 12). Then, however, there is either a suppressed antithesis, e.g. Plat. Crit. 47 d. πειθόμενοι μὴ τῇ τῶν ἐπαίωντων δόξῃ, legg. 12, 943 a.; Xen. M. 3, 9, 6; cf. Kühner II. 628;² or the negative, instead of
 576 being joined to the word denied, is prefixed to the whole sentence, as in Plato, Apol. 35 d. ἀ μήτε ἡγοῦμαι καλὰ εἶναι μήτε δίκαια, Xen. Eph. 3, 8 ὅτι μὴ τὸ φάρμακον θανάσιμον ἦν; so also in Acts vii. 48 ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ ἱψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ. Further, many expositors³ think they find a misplaced negative also in Rom. iii. 9 τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως, i.e. *by no means*
 516 (πάντως οὐ 1 Cor. xvi. 12). This interpretation is unavoidable,
 7th ed. whether we translate προεχόμεθα *have we an advantage?* or *have we a pretext?* The linguistic admissibility of this signification is proved from Theogn. 305 (250 f.)⁴ and Epiphani. haer. 38, 6, as well as by analogies such as οὐδὲν πάντως Herod. 5, 34, 65;⁵ only a transposition, strictly speaking, is not to be thought of. The phrase is rather to be understood thus: *no, assuredly; no, by no means*; and the difference between οὐ πάντως when it meant *not*

¹ We must not, however, with Fr. Mr. p. 19, refer to this head εὐθείως (εὐθύς). In Mark ii. 8; v. 30 it belongs to the participle beside which it stands. Elsewhere, Mark i. 10; ix. 15, it is put at the beginning of the sentence (see above in the text), and is easily to be construed with the principal verb. Also πάλιν in 2 Cor. xii. 21 is not transposed, but made to precede the whole sentence: *lest again, when I come, God humble me*. So, probably, also σχεδόν in Heb. ix. 22 (as if, and *almost*) applies to the sentence: all things are purged with blood. Cf. Galen. protrept. c. 1 τὰ μὲν ἅλλα ὥς σχεδόν ἄτεχνα πάντ' ἐστί. Aristot. polit. 2, 8; Lys. ed. Auger I. p. 204.

² What Valckenaer, schol. N. T. II. 574, has adduced, is not all well selected. As to other passages, in which even recent scholars assert erroneously the existence of a trajection of the negation (e.g. Thuc. 1, 5; 3, 57), see Sintenis, Plut. Themist. p. 2.

³ I do not understand on what grounds some of these expositors assert that Grotius's rendering: *not in all points*, is unwarranted. As little do I understand how οὐ πάντως omnino non is called a Hebraism. כֹּל כֹּל too in immediate connection means *non omnis*; οὐ πᾶς for οὐδείς is always so separated that the verb is negated by the οὐ, see § 26, 1. כֹּל כֹּל, however, with the omission of the verb, which Koppe quotes in loc., I do not remember to have found in the O. T.

⁴ Οἱ κακοὶ οὐ πάντως κακοὶ ἐκ γαστρὸς γεγόνασιν,
 ἀλλ' ἄνδρεςσι κακοῖς συνθέμενοι φίλῃν.

⁵ But οὐ πᾶν (μὴ πᾶν) means everywhere, *not particularly*. It is sometimes mild as to the expression, but strong as to the sense, a sort of *littotes*, see Weber, Demosth. p. 340; Franke, Demosth. p. 62. In Rom., as above, the context and tone of the passage prevent us from rendering οὐ πάντως in the same way, by a species of *littotes* (earnest or ironical), *not entirely*.

entirely and when it denoted *entirely not*, was probably indicated by the mode of utterance. Hence it was without reason that van Hengel despaired of giving a satisfactory exposition of the passage, and concluded that there must be an unnoted corruption of the text. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. v. 9 f. ἔγραψα ὑμῖν . . . μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι πόρνοις, οὐ πάντως τοῖς πόρνοις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, the expression οὐ πάντως signifies *non omnino* (Sext. Emp. Mathem. 11, 18), and the last words are a corrective explanation of μὴ συναναμ. πόρνοις: *to have no intercourse with fornicators, not absolutely with the fornicators of this world*, for then must ye needs go out of the world (but, strictly, with impure members of the church). So Luther. Likewise Heb. xi. 3 εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγυῖναι is erroneously supposed to contain a transposed negation. It is, however, correctly rendered by Schulz: so that things which may be seen have not come of 490 things visible; cf. also Bengel in loc. That which is denied is, 6th ed. ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγυῖναι, and to this sentence the 577 negative is prefixed quite according to rule. The instance to which appeal is made of a transposition of a negation in 2 Macc. vii. 28 ὅτι οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός is uncertain, as only Cod. Alex. has that reading. Tdf. has printed ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Lastly, 2 Cor. iii. 4 f. πεποιθήσω . . . ἔχομεν, οὐχ ὅτι ἱκανοί ἐσμεν etc. must not be explained thus: ὅτι οὐχ (μὴ) etc. Rather is it to be rendered: *this confidence have we . . . ; not* (referring to 2 Cor. i. 24) *that we are sufficient through ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God*. In 2 Cor. xiii. 7 Paul states the aim of εὐχόμεθα . . . μηδὲν in the words οὐχ ἵνα ἡμεῖς δόκιμοι φανώμεν, first negatively: *not that I* (if ye abstain from evil) *may appear approved* (as your teacher). In 1 Jno. iv. 10 the propriety of the arrangement οὐχ ὅτι is obvious. In Rom. iv. 12 the negation is not misplaced, but the singularity consists in the repetition of the article before στοιχοῦσιν; — a negligence of style which Fr. has tried to conceal by an artificial exposition, but which Philippi freely admits. In 517 regard to 1 Cor. xv. 51 πάντες (μὲν) οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ 7th ed. ἀλλαγησόμεθα, even after the remarks of Fr. de conformatione text. Lachm. p. 38 sq. and of van Hengel Cor. p. 216 sqq., I can only agree with Mey. That is to say, vs. 52 shows that ἀλλάττεσθαι is not applied in the wider sense (to the risen also), but in the narrower, as opposed to ἐγείρεσθαι. The passage can only be rendered: *we shall all* (the generation whom Paul addressed) — *not fall asleep, — but all be changed*. Had Paul supposed that

some of the πάντες might die, they would then belong to the νεκροί, vs. 52, and ἡμεῖς would be an inexact antithesis. Any doubt respecting Paul's having been able to foretell a thing of this sort cannot induce me to assign to ἀλλάττ. in vs. 51 a signification different from what it has in vs. 52. Mey. has answered all other objections. That in Rom. xiii. 14 τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιέισθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν is not put for μὴ εἰς ἐπιθ. is doubtless on any supposition clear, see Fr. in loc. Translators, including Luther, have taken the liberty to make a transposition in 2 Cor. xii. 20; but the arrangement in Greek is perfectly regular.

In Rom. xv. 20 οὐχ ὅπου according to Bengel is used instead of ὅπου οὐκ for greater force, and according to BCrus. it is a milder, more modest, form of expression; whereas it is simply the only correct expression: οὐτως, 578 οὐχ ὅπου ... ἀλλά etc. In Rom. viii. 12 οὐ τῇ σαρκί suggests without help the antithesis ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι. To the (appropriate) variation in the position of the negative in Rom. ii. 14 ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα and νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες Bengel had already directed attention, see also Mey. in loc.

Some critics have thought that there is a hyperbaton in 2 Tim. ii. 6 τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν δεῖ πρῶτον τῶν καρπῶν μεταλαμβάνειν. The Apostle 491 according to vs. 5 appears to mean to say: the husbandman that first laboureth, must be partaker of the fruits, i.e. the husbandman must first 5th ed. labor, before he be partaker of the fruits; so that πρῶτον belongs to κοπιᾶν, and the sentence should run accordingly, cf. Xen. C. 1, 3, 18 ὁ σὸς πρῶτος πατὴρ τεταγμένα ποιεῖ, i.e. ὁ σὸς πατὴρ πρῶτος γερ. π. To get rid of the hyperbaton, Grotius makes πρῶτον signify *demum*, which is inadmissible. Later expositors, laying the emphasis on κοπ. as purposely placed first, explain the passage thus: the laboring (not the idle) husbandman has the first right to partake of the fruits, see, especially, Wiesinger in loc. Similar and even more remarkable hyperbata are not unfrequent in Greek prose; see Plat. rep. 7, 524 a.; Xen. Cyr. 2, 1, 5; cf. Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 21; Franke, Demosth. p. 33.

In Greek authors one or more words of a relative sentence are sometimes put before the relative (Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 109), for the sake of emphasis, see above, no. 3. Several expositors have attributed this idiom to Acts i. 2, and punctuated the passage thus: τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξατο; but with little probability, as ἐντέλλ. διὰ πνεύμ. ἁγ. was here (in reference to the sequel of the Acts) the only point of importance in Luke's mind; while ἐκλέγ. διὰ τοῦ πν. fell within the range of the previous history of the Gospel; and did not need to be stated here for the 518 7th ed. first time. The general reference contained in οὓς ἐξελέξ., by which primarily the apostles are indicated, is not superfluous, as it was by that previous election that they had been prepared to receive the directions διὰ τοῦ πν., see Valcken. in loc. There would be more ground for such

punctuation in Acts v. 35 προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις τί μέλλετε πράσσειν (see Bornem. in loc.), although the usual mode of connecting the words gives a suitable meaning: *take heed to yourselves in regard to these men, what ye intend to do.*

On the other hand, it is inconceivable that Luke could have written in Acts xxvii. 39 κόλπον τῷ ἀκατέκοντον ἔχοντα αἰγυάλον for αἰγ. ἔχοντα κόλπον πινά. Grotius long ago remarked: non frustra hoc additur, sunt enim sinus quidam maris, qui litus non habent, sed praeruptis rupibus cinguntur; see also Bengel. Moreover, αἰγ. ἔχοντα must be regarded as directly joined to the relative clause εἰς ὃν etc.: *which had a beach, on which they determined to land*, i.e. a beach of such a description as may have induced them to attempt a landing. It would be equally harsh to construe, as some do, Rom. vii. 21 εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἔμοι ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν ὅτι ἔμοι τὸ κακὸν παράκειται thus: τῷ θέλοντι ἔμοι τὸν νόμον ποιεῖν, τὸ καλόν. 579 It has always appeared to me most natural to take the words thus: εἰρ. ἄρα τὸν νόμον, τῷ θέλ. . . . ὅτι ἔμοι τὸ κακὸν παράκειται invenio hanc legem (normam) volenti mihi honestum facere, ut mihi etc. See also Philippi in loc.

Many also find a trajection, sanctioned by long usage and even affecting the case (Mtth. 867), in Jno. xii. 1 πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα *six days before the Passover*, and xi. 18 ἦν ἡ Βηθανία ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε *about fifteen furlongs off*, cf. xxi. 8; Rev. xiv. 20. That is, it is thought that if the prepositions stood in the right place the language would run ἑξ ἡμέραις πρὸ τοῦ π., and ὡς σταδίων δεκ. ἀπὸ Ἱεροσ. (Luke 492 xxiv. 13). But probably in local specifications Greek phraseology proceeded from a different view of the matter, ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκ. (properly: *situated at a distance of fifteen furlongs i.e. where the fifteen furlongs terminated, at the end of fifteen furlongs*), as in Latin e.g. Liv. 24, 46 Fabius cum a quingentis fere passibus castra posuisset; Ramshorn S. 273.¹ If now it were necessary to specify besides the speaker's position, it was added to the phrase in the Genitive. The same applies to specifications of time. As it was usual to say πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν *vor sechs Tagen, before* (the last past) *six days*, the form of expression was retained when it was necessary to indicate the point of time from which the period in question was counted, as πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (cf. Evang. apocr. p. 436 f.). But whatever explanation we may give of the construction, both these forms of expression (the temporal and the local) were of frequent occurrence in later Greek, cf. Ael. anim. 11, 19 πρὸ πέντε ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἀφανισθῆναι τὴν Ἑλίην, Xen. Eph. 3, 3; Lucian. Cronos 14; Geopon. 12, 31, 2; Achill. Tat. 7, 14 (and Jacobs in loc.); Epiphan. Opp. II. 248 a.; Strabo 10, 483; 15, 715 καταλαβεῖν ἄνδρας πεντεκαίδεκα ἀπὸ σταδίων εἴκοσι τῆς πόλεως, 519 Plutarch. Philop. 4 ἦν ἀγρὸς αὐτῷ καλὸς ἀπὸ σταδίων εἴκοσι τῆς πόλεως, Diod. 7th ed.

¹ Polyasn. 2, 35 τοὺς πολλοὺς δέκλυσεν ἀπὸ βραχέος διαστήματος ὅπως αἰσθάνεται is also illustrative.

S. 2, 7; Acta apocr. p. 39, 61; see Reiske, Const. Porphyrog. II. 20 ed. Bonn; Schaef. Long. p. 129. Kühnöl directs attention to the following passages of the Sept.: Amos i. 1 *πρὸ δύο ἐτῶν τοῦ σεισμοῦ*, iv. 7 *πρὸ τριῶν μηνῶν τοῦ τρυγητοῦ*, with Sing. *πρὸ μᾶς ἡμέρας τῆς Μαρδοχαϊκῆς ἡμέρας*, 2 Macc. xv. 36 (Joseph. antt. 15, 11, 4; Plut. symp. 8, 1, 1). Such phrases (in a temporal sense) are also composed with *μετά*, as in Plut. Coriol. 11 *μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀλίγας τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς τελευτῆς*, Malal. 4, p. 88 *μετὰ νβ' ἔτη τοῦ τελευτήσαι τὴν Πασιφάνην*, Anon. chron. (before Malal. ed. Bonn.) p. 10 *μετὰ δύο ἔτη τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ*, see Schaef. ad Bos, ellips. p. 553 sq.

6. The position of certain particles and enclitic pronouns is fixed with greater or less precision in Greek, according to their importance in the sentence. For instance, *μέν* (*μενούγγε*, *μέντοι*), *οὖν*, *δέ*, *γάρ*, *γε*, *τοίνυν*, *ἄρα*, ought not to begin a sentence (*ἄρα* also ought not to begin an apodosis, Xen. C. 1, 3, 2; 8, 4, 7). With regard to most of these this rule is observed likewise in the N. T.;¹ and *δέ*, *γάρ*, *οὖν*, have sometimes the 2d, sometimes the 3d, sometimes even the 4th place (though the Codd. do not everywhere agree). They occupy the 3d or 4th place, particularly, when it is necessary to avoid separating words that are intimately connected [especially prepositional phrases], as in Gal. iii. 23 *πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν*, [Heb. i. 13 *πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων*], Mark i. 38 *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξεληλύθα*, Luke vi. 23; xv. 17; 2 Cor. i. 19 *ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γὰρ υἱός*, Acts xxvii. 14 *μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἔβαλε* etc., Jno. viii. 16 *καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ*, 1 Jno. ii. 2 *οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον*, 1 Cor. viii. 4 *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων*, 2 Cor. x. 1 *ὃς κατὰ πρόσωπον μὲν ταπεινός*, Jno. xvi. 22; Acts iii. 21. Cf. on *δέ* (Her. 8, 68; Aelian. anim. 7, 27; Xen. M. 2, 1, 16; 5, 4, 13; Diod. S. 11, 11; Thuc. 1, 6, 70; Arrian. Al. 2, 2, 2; Xen. eq. 11, 8; Lucian. eunuch. 4; dial. mort. 5, 1; Sext. Emp. math. 7, 65; Strabo 17, 808) Hm. Orph. p. 820; Boisson. Aristaenet. p. 687; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 302; III. I. 71; Stallb. Phileb. p. 90; Franke, Demosth. p. 208; on *γάρ* Schaef. melet. crit. p. 76; V. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 100; on *μέν* Hm. Orph. as above, Bornem. Xenoph. conv. p. 61; Weber, Demosth. 402. On the other hand, *ἄρα* (see Hm. Soph. Antig. 628) is frequently, contrary to Greek usage, placed *first*, as in Luke xi. 48; Rom. x. 17; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. ii. 21; v. 11 etc.; so also *ἄρα οὖν* in Rom. v. 18; vii. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 15; Eph. ii. 19, etc. Likewise *μενούγγε* begins a period

¹ *Ἐφη*, inserted in the direct discourse of a third party, occurs only in Acts xxiii. 35; but *φησί* in Matt. xiv. 8; Acts xxv. 5, 22; xxvi. 25, etc. Usually we find in the N. T. *ὁ Παῦλος ἔφη*, *ὁ δὲ ἔφη*, before the *oratio recta*, which in Greek authors is the more rare usage, *Mdv.* S. 260.

in Luke xi. 28; Rom. ix. 20; x. 18; see Lob. Phryn. p. 342; so also *τοῖνυν* in Heb. xiii. 13. The latter very seldom begins a sentence in the better authors; for instances in later writers, see ^{7th ed.} Lob. Phryn. l.c. They are especially frequent in Sext. Emp., as in Math. 1, 11, 14, 25, 140, 152, 155, 217, etc. Among the Byzantines, cf. Cinnam. p. 125, 136, ed. Bonn.¹

Whether the indefinite *τις* can stand as the first word of a clause has been doubted, Mtth. Eurip. suppl. 1187 and Sprachl. 1081. Though from the nature of the case it may rarely begin a sentence, yet approved critics ⁵⁸¹ have with high probability established its claim to the first place in Soph. Trach. 865, and Oed. R. 1471 (cf. vs. 1475), Aeschyl. Choeph. 640 (Hm.). In prose cf. Plat. Theaet. 147 c.; Plut. tranq. c. 13. In the N. T. *τις* beginning a sentence is established in Matt. xxvii. 47; Luke vi. 2; Jno. xiii. 29; 1 Tim. v. 24; Phil. i. 15.

Ἀλλά γε *yet at least* are, in the more ancient authors, always separated by a word (though it be but a particle), Klotz, Devar. p. 15 sq. This rule is not observed in Luke xxiv. 21 *ἀλλά γε σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει*, see Bornem. in loc.

Moreover, *μέν* is regularly placed after the word to which according to the sense it belongs.² There are, however, some exceptions to this rule: Acts xxii. 3 *ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος, γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ* (for *ἐγὼ ε. ἀ. ἰ. γεγενν. μὲν* etc.), Tit. i. 15 *πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς, τοῖς δὲ μεμιασμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρὸν* for *τοῖς μὲν καθαρ. πάντα καθ.* etc. or *πάντα μὲν καθ. . . οὐδὲν δὲ καθ. τ. μ.,* 1 Cor. ii. 15. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 1, 6; 3, 9, 8; Ael. anim. 2, 31; Diog. L. 6, 60, see Hm. Soph. Oed. R. 436; Hartung, Partik. II. 415 f. Yet good Codd. have omitted *μέν* in the above three passages of the N. T. [Cod. Sin. also in the first two; yet in the second, corrector C has added *μέν*], and recent editors have accepted their authority. Might it not have been expunged because it was displeasing?

The proper position of *τε* is after the word which stands parallel to another, as in Acts xiv. 1 *Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος*, ix. 2; xx. 21; xxvi. 3. It is, however, not unfrequently inserted with more license, as in Acts xxvi. 22 (Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. 622, yet cf. Schoem. Isae. p. 325); and, in particular, it stands immediately after a preposition or article, as in Acts x. 39; ii. 33; xxviii. 23; Jno. ii. 15, etc., in which

¹ But *μέντοι* always stands after some other word that commences the sentence. It is otherwise in later writers, see Boissonade, Anecd. II. 27.

² When several words have a grammatical connection, as article and noun, preposition and noun, *μέν* may be placed immediately after the first, e.g. Luke x. 2 *ὁ μὲν θερισμός*, Heb. xii. 11 *πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρόν*, Acts i. 1; viii. 4 etc. (Demosth. Lacrit. 595 a.). So also *μὲν οὖν* in Lysias pecun. publ. 3 *ἐν μὲν οὖν τῷ πολέμῳ*. Cf. Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 61. This holds also of other conjunctions, see above, p. 363. Also the names of a single person are separated by such conjunctions, Jno. xviii. 10 *Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος*.

exposition propounded by Fritzsche (diss. in Cor. II. 9), which de Wette ably combats. This last critic has recently reproduced the above explanation [which Mey. also has adopted in his 2d, 3d, and 4th eds.], and I recall the view that I formerly upheld. As to Jno. xi. 15, see above, § 53, 10, 6, p. 459. (In Mark xii. 12 there is nothing whatever of the nature of a trajection. To the double clause is annexed, after its conclusion, the ground of the first member, and then in καὶ ἀφέντες etc. the result is expressed. 522 Similar is Mark xvi. 3. In Phil. i. 16 f. the two clauses should, 7th ed. on the best testimony [Sin. also], be thus arranged: οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀγάπης . . . οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας, thus in converse relation to vs. 15; 583 this can perplex no reader.)

When, in the arrangement of individual clauses, the dependent are placed before the principal, e.g. telic clauses, as in Matt. xvii. 27; Acts xxiv. 4; Jno. i. 31; xix. 28, 31; 2 Cor. xii. 7; Rom. ix. 11 (see Fr. Rom. II. 297), relative clauses, as in Mark xi. 23; Jno. iii. 11; Rom. viii. 29 etc., conditional clauses, as in 1 Cor. vi. 4; xiv. 9, the grounds of such arrangement are obvious to every attentive reader, cf. Kühner II. 626. Here belongs, probably, also 1 Cor. xv. 2 τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμεν ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε; see Mey. in loc.

§ 62. INTERRUPTED STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; PARENTHESES.

1. Interrupted sentences are those whose grammatical flow is obstructed by the insertion of a clause complete in itself;¹ as, Acts xiii. 8 ἀνθίστατο αὐτοῖς Ἑλύμας ὁ μάγος — οὕτως γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ — ζητῶν διαστρέφαι etc., Rom. i. 13 οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς — καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο — ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν ὀσχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν. The clause thus inserted is denominated a *parenthesis*,² and is usually separated visibly from the rest of the period by the well-known parenthetical marks.³ According to the preceding definition the 496

7th ed.

¹ The definition given in *Ruddimann's* Instit. II. 396, ed. *Stallb.* is not amiss: *parenthesis est sententia sermoni, antequam absolvatur, interjecta.* *Wilke's* definition (*Rhetor. S.* 226) is too comprehensive.

² *Ch. Wolle*, comment. de parenthesi sacra. Lips. 1726. 4to.; *J. F. Hirt*, diss. de parenthesi et generatim et speciatim sacra. Jen. 1745. 4to.; *A. B. Spitzner*, comment. philol. de parenthesi libris V. et N. T. accommodata. L. 1773. 8vo.; *J. G. Lindner*, 2 comment. de parenthesis Johanneis. Arnstad. 1765. 4to. (A work de parenthesis Paullinis is a desideratum.) Cf. also *Clerici ars crit.* II. 144 sqq. Lips.; *Baumgarten*, ausführl. Vortr. über die Hermeneutik S. 217 ff.; *Keil*, Lehrbuch der Hermen. S. 58 f. (mostly incorrect).

³ To throw away all external marks of a (true) parenthesis, and yet retain inter-

name of *parentheses* cannot be applied, in the first place, to inserted subordinate clauses, even though of considerable length, if they are connected in construction with the principal clause by a relative or as Gen. absol. (Rom. xvi. 4; ix. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 6; 1 Cor. v. 4; 584 Luke i. 70; ii. 23; Eph. vi. 2; Acts iv. 36), still less to clauses in apposition, such as Jno. xiv. 22; xv. 26; 1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Jno. 1; Acts ix. 17; Mark vii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 21, or to clauses annexed by way of explanation or reason to a *concluded* sentence, such as 523 Jno. iv. 6, 8, 10; xi. 2, 51 f.; xiii. 11; xviii. 5; xix. 23; Mark 7th ed. vii. 3 f. 26; Matt. i. 22 f.; Luke i. 55; Acts i. 15; viii. 16; Rom. viii. 36; 1 Cor. ii. 8; xv. 41; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. ii. 8; Heb. v. 13; viii. 5; vii. 11; Rev. xxi. 25, or lastly, to those with which the continuation of the discourse, beyond the alleged parenthesis, is grammatically connected, as 1 Cor. xvi. 5 ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὅταν Μακεδονίαν διέλθω (Μακεδονίαν γὰρ διέρχομαι), πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχὸν παραμηνῶ, where, indeed, Μακεδ. and ὑμᾶς, διέρχ. and παραμ. stand obviously in mutual relation, Gal. iv. 24; Heb. iii. 4; Jno. xxi. 8; Rom. ix. 11; Mark v. 13; vii. 26. Parentheses are introduced either *asyndetically* or by *καί* (Fr. Rom. I. 35) *δέ* or *γάρ* Rom. i. 13; vii. 1; Eph. v. 9; Heb. vii. 11; Jno. [xvii. 10] xix. 31; 1 Tim. ii. 7; Acts xii. 3; xiii. 8; 1 Jno. i. 2, and after them the construction either proceeds regularly, or is resumed (sometimes with some alteration) by the repetition of a word from the principal clause, with or without a conjunction, as in 2 Cor. v. 8; 1 Jno. i. 3. It does not, however, follow from the latter circumstance, that a series of words may be regarded as a parenthesis, as Eph. i. 13 ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε etc. ii. 11 ff.; 1 Cor. viii. 1 (see Mey.); 2 Cor. v. 6 ff.; Jno. xxi. 21; so too, where the construction which had been commenced is not grammatically resumed, but the thread of discourse is continued in a new and independent form, the structure is not parenthetical, but *anacoluthic* (§ 63), e.g. Rom. v. 12 ff.

2. The number of parentheses in the N. T. is not small, but not so large as earlier expositors and editors (even Knapp) assumed. Besides the insertion of single words, which is common also in Greek and Latin authors (cf. *nudius tertius*), as in 2 Cor. viii. 3 *κατὰ δύναμιν, μαρτυρῶ, κ. παρὰ δύναμιν αὐθαίρετοι*, Heb. x. 29 *πόσχα,*

punction, would be inconsistent. But in by far the greatest number of cases, commas suffice for distinguishing inserted words. Round brackets seem to be most suitable as parenthetical marks.

δοκεῖτε, χεῖρωνος ἀξιοθήσεται τιμωρίας,¹ 2 Cor. x. 10 αἱ μὲν ἐπιστολαί, φησὶν, βαρεῖαι (see above, § 58, 9), xi. 21; Rom. iii. 5, there are in the historical books frequent explanations respecting place, time, occasion etc. expressed parenthetically, as in Acts xii. 8 προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρω—ἦσαν δὲ ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων—ὄν etc., i. 15; xiii. 8; Luke ix. 28 ἐγένετο μετὰ τ. λόγους τούτους, ὥς εἰ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, καὶ etc. (cf. Isocr. Phil. p. 216; Lucian. dial. 497 mar. 1, 4),² Acts v. 7 ἐγένετο δέ, ὡς ὥρων τριῶν διάστημα, καὶ ἡ γυνή etc., Matt. xv. 32 (cf. Lucian. dial. mar. 1, 4; Schaef. Demosth. V. 388); Luke xxiii. 51; Jno. iii. 1 ἦν ἄνθρωπος, Νικόδημος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, ἀρχῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, xix. 31 (Diog. L. 8, 42); Luke xiii. 24 πολλοί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν etc. Sometimes the narrator interrupts with such an explanation the direct discourse of another: Mark vii. 11 ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος· κορβᾶν, ὃ ἐστὶν δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς, Jno. i. 39 οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ· ῥαββί, ὃ λέγεται ἐρμηνευόμενον διδάσκαλε, ποῦ μένεις;³ Sometimes an exhortation is thrust in in the same way, as Matt. xxiv. 15 f. ὅταν ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα . . . ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ, ὃ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ etc.

3. There is no parenthesis in Jno. xi. 30: vs. 30 is so far connected with vs. 29 as it was necessary to mention the place to which Mary went; and after the narrator has completed the account of her going out, he passes in vs. 31 to her attendants

¹ Aristoph. Acharn. 12 πῶς τοῦτ' ἔλασέ μου, δοκεῖς, τὴν καρδίαν; Viljois. anecd. II. 24 πόσων, οἰσθε, θυγατέρας . . . ἐξέδωκεν;

² The Greek idiom to which this has been compared by Kühnol and others (the so called schema Pindaricum, see Fischer, Weller. III. 345 sq.; Vig. p. 192 sq.; Hm. Soph. Trach. 517; Boeckh, Pindar. II. II. 684 sq.; J. V. Brigleb, diss. in loc. Luc. ix. 28, Jen. 1739. 4to.) lies too remote, being almost exclusively poetic (Kühner II. 50 f.), and its application is not favored by ἐγένετο, usually employed absolutely (nowhere ἐγένοντο ἡμέραι ὀκτώ etc.). Further, Matt. xv. 32 also is to be explained in the same way as Luke ix. 28: ὅτι ἦδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς, προσημέναις μοι according to the best Codd., where Fr., overlooking the loose manner in which such specifications of time are introduced, has printed (from D): ἦδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς εἰσι καὶ προσημέν. etc., which is a manifest correction. On Mark viii. 2, however, he has admitted the correctness of the common text. See also his letter Ueber die Verdienste Tholuck's S. 17. Also Luke xlii. 16 ἦν ἔθνησαν ὁ σαταῖς, ἰδοὺ δέκα, καὶ δεκά ἐτη etc. I have no hesitation in taking, with Bengel, in the same way.

³ Different from this is the case in which the writer subjoins incidentally such an explanation to the words of another, and then proceeds in his own person, Jno. ix. 7 ὅπαγε νύμφα εἰς τ. κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλῶμ, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται ἀπεσταλμένος. ἀπηλθὼν οὖν etc., i. 42, 44; Matt. i. 22 f.; xxi. 4 f. In all these cases there is no trace of a parenthesis. Matt. ix. 6 is not so much a parenthesis as a blending of the oratio directa and indir.; and in Heb. x. 8 the author introduces, indeed, his own words in the midst of the quotation, but he does this by means of a relative clause.

who went out also. In Jno. xix. 5 the narrative proceeds quite regularly, for the change of subject does not render a parenthesis necessary. In Matt. xvi. 26 also parenthetical marks appear to be unnecessary (though Schulz has retained them); for vs. 26 adds to τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιωθῆ an illustration of the value of the ψυχή. In vs. 27 the reference is to vss. 25 and 26 inclusively; no interruption of the construction can be perceived. In xxi. 4f. a remark is added by the narrator; but in vs. 6 the simple narrative continues. Similar is Jno. vi. 6. In Jno. i. 14 probably the words καὶ ἐθεασάμ. . . πατρός were not regarded by the author as an insertion; but, after the completion of the complex sentence, 498 the summary πλήρης χάρι. κ. ἀληθ. is added in grammatical independence, somewhat as in Phil. iii. 19 or Mark xii. 40. Luke vii. 29f. contain no parenthesis (Lchm.), but words of Christ, who previously, and again in vs. 31, is speaking. In Mark iii. 17 the assumption of a parenthesis is not sufficient to explain the construction, but vss. 16-19 are expressed in oratio variata, see 525 § 63 II. 1. There is no parenthesis in Jno. vi. 23; it is connected with ὅτι in vs. 22. The proposal of Ziegler (in Gabler's Journ. für theolog. Lit. I. 155) to include in a parenthesis the words καὶ ἦσαν . . . γυναικῶν Acts v. 12 ff. has, very properly, found no favor with editors (except Schott); and those critics also who have suspected something spurious in vss. 12-15 (Eichhorn, Beck, Kühnöl) have been too precipitate. The words ὥστε κατὰ τὰς πλατείας ἐκφέρειν τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς etc. are very aptly connected with vs. 14; the two facts, that the people held the apostles in high estimation, and that the number of believers increased, readily explain why the sick were brought out into the streets. The words, indeed, connect themselves with vs. 14 far more neatly than with vs. 12. Are we to understand by πολλὰ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα (ἐν τῷ λαῷ) merely the preceding events, the effect of which was ὥστε ἐκφέρειν etc.? To assume this would be to sacrifice the perspicuity of the narrative. For what else could those πολλὰ σημεῖα have been but miracles of healing? Thus in the words ὥστε κατὰ etc. what had been only briefly indicated in vs. 12 recurs in another connection to be narrated more in detail (vs. 15f.). Accordingly, I cannot bring myself to make with Lchm. vs. 14 a parenthesis. On the other hand, in Acts x. 36 τὸν λόγον is probably to be connected with vs. 37, and the words οὗτος etc., which as a complete sentence express a leading thought that Peter could not well annex by a relative, form a parenthesis; and in vs. 37

the speaker, after this interruption, proceeds by an *amplification* of the thought.

4. In the Epistles also parentheses, especially short ones, occur, which contain sometimes a limitation, 1 Cor. vii. 11, sometimes a 587 corroboration, 1 Tim. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 5, sometimes a reason or more precise explanation, Rom. vii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 7; vi. 2; x. 4; xii. 2; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. ii. 5; v. 9; Jas. iv. 14; 2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Jno. i. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 5, or any thought whatever that obtruded itself upon the writer (Col. iv. 10; Rom. i. 13). But we find in the Epistles some parentheses also of greater length, as in Heb. vii. 20 f. *οἱ μὲν γάρ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, since *καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας* vs. 20 is obviously connected with vs. 22 *κατὰ τοσοῦτο κρείττονος* etc.; and in Rom. ii. 13–15, since vs. 16 *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρινεῖ* etc. is after all most appropriately connected with *κριθήσονται* vs. 12, for *κρινεῖ* glances back at *κριθήσονται*. Vss. 13–15, however, constitute an independent group of thoughts, appended to vs. 12 as explanatory: it is the doing, not the hearing, of the law which is required, vs. 13; but the righteous heathen even are doers of 499 the law, vss. 14, 15. But many lengthened insertions are not 6th ed. parentheses but digressions, inasmuch as they check merely the 526 progress of thought and not the sequence of construction. So in 7th ed. 1 Cor. viii. 1–3 Paul, after grammatically concluding the clause *περὶ δὲ . . . ἔχομεν*, allows himself, from *ἡ γνώσις* to *ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*, to digress on *γνώσις* in relation to *ἀγάπη*, and, resuming the thread of the discourse, returns in vs. 4 *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν* etc. to vs. 1. Similar digressions occur in 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10 and 2 Cor. iii. 14–18 (iv. 1 is connected with iii. 12). In Rom. xiii. 9 f. by *καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες* Paul returns to *μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε*, which is to be mentally repeated. Finally, in most of the passages usually adduced as parentheses, there is neither parenthesis nor digression: In Tit. i. 1 ff. *κατὰ πίστιν* is connected with *ἀπόστολος*, and the destination of Paul's apostleship is fully brought out in the clause *κ. πίστ. . . αἰωνίου*, while to *ζωῆς αἰών.* is appended the relative clause *ἣν* as far as *θεοῦ*. Likewise in Rom. i. 1–7, where even Schott in his last edition assumes two parentheses, the whole passage flows with one unbroken thread, only the main conceptions in vss. 3 f. 5, 6 are amplified by relative clauses. So also in Col. iii. 12–14, where *ἀνεχόμενοι* (corresponding to *ἐνδύσασθε*) is a modal specification of *μακροθυμίαν* (perhaps also of *πραότητα*), but is itself re-enforced by *καθώς* etc. Only *οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς* may appear to interrupt the structure, as the thought is already expressed

through *καθώς* in the connection of the preceding clause ; but if *χαριζόμενοι* be there supplied, the construction becomes regular. In Heb. xii. there is the less ground for regarding vss. 20, 21 as 588 a parenthesis (Lchm.), since in vs. 22 *προσεληλύθατε* is repeated from vs. 18 ; so that a new sentence begins, an affirmative opposed to the negative group of sentences vss. 18–21. In 1 Cor. i. 8 *ὅς* refers to *Χριστός* vs. 7, and vss. 5 and 6 contain no parenthesis. In Rom. xvi. 4 the two connected relative clauses occasion no real break in the structure and cannot be regarded as parenthetical. In 1 Pet. iii. 6 *ἀγαθοποιούσαις* is connected with *ἐγενήθητε*, and the words *ὡς . . . τέκνα* are not parenthetical. In Eph. iii. 5 *ὁ ἐτέρας* etc. is joined to *ἐν μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χ.* vs. 4 ; and in 2 Pet. i. 5 (Schott) *αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ σπ. παρεισενέγκαντες* stands parallel to *ὡς πάντα . . . δεδορημένης* etc., and vs. 4 is an explanatory relative clause to the words *διὰ δόξης καὶ ὑπερηφ.* On 1 Jno. iv. 17 ff. ; Eph. i. 21 hardly any remark is required. In Eph. ii. 11 *οἱ λεγ. . . χειροστ.* is an apposition to *τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί*, and the repetition of *ὅτι* in vs. 12 cannot convert what precedes into a parenthesis. Lastly, anacolutha occur in Col. iii. 16 ; 2 Pet. ii. 4–8 (in the latter passage occasioned by vs. 8, see § 63, I. 1 p. 569) and 1 Tim. i. 3 ff.

In Eph. iii. 1 ff. the Predicate is not *ὁ δέσμιος*, for then, if the meaning were ego Paulus vinculis detineor, the article would be omitted ; and the 500 sense *I am the prisoner of Christ* (*κατ' ἐσχάτην*), does not recommend itself. 5th ed. The simplest mode of explaining the passage is, after Theodoret, to recognize in *τούτου χάριν* vs. 14 the resumption of the thought interrupted in 527 vs. 1 ; especially as the intercession vs. 14 sqq. finds its appropriate occasion in the very fact that Paul had been by his imprisonment withdrawn from his personal labors, and *τούτου χάριν* also in vs. 1 receives its natural import. With far less probability others join iv. 1 to iii. 1, since there 1st ed. *ὁ δέσμιος* seems to refer to *ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος*. Cf. Cramer, translation of Eph. p. 71 ff., who quotes and tests other conjectures, and Harless.

§ 63. BROKEN AND HETEROGENEOUS STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; ANACOLUTHON, ORATIO VARIATA.

I. 1. Anacoluthon¹ occurs when the construction with which a

¹ *Hm.* Vig. 894 sqq. (who explains poetic anacolutha almost exclusively) ; *Poppo*, Thuc. I. I. 360 sqq. ; *Kühner* II. 616 ff. ; *Mdv.* 253 ff. ; *F. Richter*, de praecep. graec. lingu. anacoluth. Mühlh. 1827 f. 2 spec. 4to. ; *v. Wannowski*, Syntax. anomal. graec. pars cet. Lips. 1835. 8vo. ; *F. W. Engelhardt*, Anacoluth. Plat. spec. 1–3, Gedani 1834 ff. 4to. (cf. *Gernhard*, Cic. offic. p. 441 sq. ; *Matthiae*, de anacoluth. ap. Ciceron. in *Wdf*, Analect. lit. III. 1 sqq.). For the N. T. *Fritzsche*, Conjectan. spec. 1 (Lips. 1825. 8vo.) p. 33 sq.

sentence began is not grammatically pursued;—either because 589 the writer is wholly diverted from the structure adopted at the beginning by something intervening (especially by parentheses, see Beier, Cic. off. II. 365), or because for the sake of a preferable mode of expression (Weber, Demosth. 538) he frames the close of his sentence otherwise than the commencement required.¹ Hence anacolutha are sometimes involuntary, sometimes intentional. To the latter class belong also those which have a rhetorical ground (Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 221), or which originate, as Hm. Vig. 895 expresses it, a motu animi vel ab arte oratoris vim aliquam captante. In writers of great mental vivacity and activity, more taken up with the thought than with the expression, anacolutha are most frequently to be expected. Hence they are especially numerous in the epistolary style of the Apostle Paul. We specially point out the following: Acts xv. 22 ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις . . . ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι . . . γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν (Lys. in Eratosth. 7 ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς . . . ὥσπερ . . . πεποιηκότες, Antiphon. p. 613 Reisk. ἔδοξεν αὐτῇ βουλομένη βέλτιον εἶναι μετὰ δεῖπνον δοῦναι, ταῖς Κλυταιμνήστρας τῆς τοῦτου μητρὸς ὑποθήκαις ἅμα διακονοῦσα, vice versa Plat. legg. 3, 686 d. ἀποβλέψας πρὸς τοῦτον τὸν στόλον, οὐ πῆρι διαλογόμεθα, ἔδοξέ μοι πάγκαλος εἶναι— as, in general, often with ἔδοξε—, Plat. Apol. 501 21c.; Xen. Cyr. 6, 1, 31; Lucian. Astrol. 3; Schwarz, soloecism. p. 86sq.);² Acts xx. 3 ποιήσας μῆνας τρεῖς, γενομένης αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλῆς 528 . . . μέλλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν Συρίαν, ἐγένετο γνώμη, etc. In Rom. xvi. 25–27 τῷ δυναμένῳ . . . μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χρ., φη' ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Paul is led away from the intended construction by his extended statement respecting God in vs. 25, 26, and, instead of immediately annexing ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, forms a relative clause out of the contents of the doxology, as if the Dative θεῷ concluded a sentence. Similar is Acts xxiv. 5, where ἐκρατήσαμεν vs. 6 should without anything further have been added to the participle εὐρόντες τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον; Luke, however, led astray 590 by the relative clause ὃς καὶ etc. has made it, too, a part of the relative sentence: ὃν καὶ ἐκρατ. More remarkable are the anacolutha in periods of smaller extent:³ as in Acts xix. 34 ἐπιγόντες,

¹ Accordingly, in 1 Jno. i. 1 ff. there is no anacoluthon, as vs. 3, by a grammatically regular repetition of the words of the first verse after the intermediate clause vs. 2, is connected strictly with the beginning of the sentence.

² In Latin cf. Hirt. bell. afric. 25 dum haec ita fierent, rex Juba, cognitis . . . , non est visum, etc. Plin. ep. 10, 34.

³ One of the most singular is perhaps that adduced by Kypke II. 104: Hippocr. morb

ὅτι Ἰουδαῖός ἐστι, φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων (instead of ἐφώνησαν ἅπαντες), Mark ix. 20 ἰδὼν (ὁ παῖς) αὐτόν, τὸ πνεῦμα εὐθὺς ἐσπάραξεν αὐτόν (instead of ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐσπαράχθη), to which Fr. compares Anthol. pal. 11, 488 (?) *καὶ γὰρ δ' αὐτὸν ἰδὼν, τὸ στόμα μου δέδεται*, see also Plat. legg. 6, 769 c. Further, in Luke xi. 11 *τίνα ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ*; the question, *will he give?* pre-supposes a protasis: *a father when asked for bread by his son*, or, *a father whom his son asks for bread* (Matt. vii. 9). So too in Acts xxiii. 30 *μνησθείσης μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι*, where the construction should have continued *μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι*; whereas *μέλλειν* might have been employed, had the clause been introduced somehow thus: *μνησθέντων ἐπιβουλῇ*, etc. Cf. § 45, 6. Probably the construction was intentionally altered in 1 Cor. xii. 28 *οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους* etc., where Paul at first meant to write *οὓς μὲν . . . ἀποστ., οὓς δὲ προφ.* etc.; but instead of employing mere juxtaposition, he preferred an arrangement according to rank, so that now *οὓς μὲν* stands quite isolated, and the subsequent abstracts also, *ἔπειτα δυνάμεις*, are appended to the simple *ἔθετο*, which alone the writer still had in his mind. Likewise in Tit. i. 3 the Apostle, by the introduction of *τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ* in connection with *ἐφανερώσε δὲ* etc., seizes on a more suitable turn of expression. Cf. besides 2 Cor. vii. 5 (1 Cor. vii. 26). Still more incoherent are the composite parts of an anacoluthic period in Jno. vi. 22 *τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος . . . ἰδὼν, ὅτι . . . (ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθε πλοιάρια . . .), ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν* 529 *ὁ ὄχλος* etc., where *εἶδεν* in consequence of the words inserted 7th ed. has acquired a more comprehensive object than belonged to *ἰδὼν*.

In Gal. ii. 6 *ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι — ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδὲν* 502 *μοι διαφέρει — ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέβητο*, where the 6th ed. Apostle should have continued in the Passive, but is so disturbed by the parenthetic clause that he frames a new sentence with *γάρ*.¹

vulg. 5, 1 ἐν Ἡλίδι ἡ τοῦ κηρωτοῦ γυνὴ πυρετὸς εἶχεν αὐτὴν ξυνεχῆς καὶ φάρμακα πίνουσα οὐδὲν ὠφελέετο. Cf. also Bar. 1, 9 μετὰ τὸ ἀποικίσαι Ναβουχοδονόσορ τὸν Ἰερουσαλὴν . . . καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτόν, etc. Act. apocr. p. 69.

¹ In sense *Herm.*'s explanation (Progr. de locis ep. ad Gal. p. 7) agrees with this. He assumes, however, an aposiopesis after *ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκ. . . τι*. See in opposition, *Fritzschke*, 2d Progr. p. 13. (*Fritzschior. Opusc.* 211 sq.). The latter considers the words *ἀπὸ . . . τι*, with which as he thinks vs. 5. should conclude, as parallel to *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεῖδκτους ψευδᾶς*, and renders: *propter irreptitios autem et falsos sodales* (se circumcidi non passus est), *quippe qui . . . quibus . . . ut . . . a viris autem, qui auctoritate valerent* (circumcisionis necessitatem sibi imponi non sivit). See, on the other hand, *Meyer*. I have found no reason to give up my view of the passage.

So in vs. 4 f. *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεϊσάκτους ψευδαδελφούς . . . οἷς οὐδὲ* 591 *πρὸς ὧραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ* etc., the parenthetical insertion in vs. 4 occasioned the anacoluthon. The Apostle might either have said: *on account of the false brethren* (to please them) . . . *we did not cause Titus to be circumcised*; or, *we could by no means* (in this respect) *give way to the false brethren*. The two constructions are here blended.¹ In Rom. ii. 17 ff., vss. 17–20 constitute the protasis, and vs. 21 begins the apodosis. Paul, having continued through several clauses the thought which he brought out as protasis, loses sight of *εἰ* vs. 17, and in appending the apodosis vs. 21 falls into another construction by means of *οὖν*, which particle indicates an anacoluthon. The explanation differs but little, if *οὖν* be taken for a conjunction employed to resume and sum up the protasis (Klotz, Devar. II. 718 sq.), as it very frequently in Greek authors begins the apodosis. For the words *ὁ διδάσκων* etc. *ὁ κηρύσσων* etc., whether they be taken as a question or as a reproachful assertion, alter the natural course of the sentence. That is to say, after the protasis *εἰ δέ* etc. the sentence would simply run: *thou shouldst carry into effect this knowledge of the law by a corresponding conduct* (cf. vs. 23). That the construction selected by Paul is more forcible is obvious.² The anacoluthon in the following passages is harsher: In 2 Pet. ii. 4 the protasis *εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο* etc. has no grammatical apodosis. The Apostle meant to say: *neither* (much less) *will he spare these* 530 *false teachers*. But as one instance of divine punishment suggested itself to his mind after another (vss. 4–8), he first in vs. 9 592 reverts with an altered construction to the thought (generalizing 503 it also) which was to form the apodosis. In Rom. v. 12, to the 504 words *ὥςπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε* one might have expected the apodosis: *οὕτω δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου (Χριστοῦ) δικαιοσύνη καὶ διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡ ζωή*. But, by the

¹ To repeat, with Fr. (Progr. I. in ep. ad Gal. p. 24, Opusc. p. 178 sq.), after *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεϊσάκτους ψευδαδ.*, the words *οὐκ ἠναγκάσθη περιτμ.* (*ὁ Τίτος*) is no easier at all. Paul, unless we regard him as an inexperienced writer, could only omit these words in case the appended relative clauses had made him lose sight of the commencement of the period. But in this way the explanations of the sentence, which is at any rate irregular, amount pretty much to the same thing. Besides, there would be no singularity of style in the statement: *but not even Titus . . . was compelled to be circumcised. And because of the false brethren stealthily brought in, he did not allow himself to be compelled (to be circumcised).*

² In a grammatical point of view cf. Xen. C. 6, 2, 9, where the commencement *ἐπεὶ δὲ* . . . *ἤλθον* etc. § 12 is resumed in the words *ὥς οὖν ταῦτα ἤκουσεν ὁ στρατὸς τοῦ Κέρου*, and the apodosis connected with it.

explanation annexed in vss. 12-14 to εἰσῆλθεν ἡ ἁμαρτία καὶ ὁ θάνατος, the regular construction is broken off (though in ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος an intimation of the antithesis is given); and besides, the Apostle recollects that not merely a simple *parallel* between Adam and Christ might be drawn (ὥσπερ . . . οὕτως), but that something greater and more pervasive has proceeded from Christ than from Adam. Hence the epanorthosis πολλῶ μᾶλλον, which was noticed by so early an expositor as Calvin. The connection is resumed in the words ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα etc. vs. 15, which logically absorb the apodosis, and in εἰ γὰρ . . . ἀπέθανον the substance of the protasis vs. 12 is briefly recapitulated. After this Paul combines vs. 18 the twofold parallel (likeness and unlikeness) in one final result. In a similar way must be explained 1 Tim. i. 3 ff. Καθὼς παρεκάλεσα entirely wants an apodosis, which escaped the attention of Paul while he was introducing directly into the protasis the object of παρακαλεῖν. The apodosis should run thus: οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ, ἵνα παραγγείλῃς etc. To consider vss. 5-17 as a parenthesis, as even Bengel does, is wholly unnatural; it is still more absurd, however, to take καθὼς for an untranslatable particle of transition (Heydenreich). Many ancient and modern expositors regard Rom. ix. 22 ff. as a very singular and in part double anacoluthon; see the different views in Reiche. But it is probably simpler to join καὶ ἵνα vs. 22 to ἤνεγκεν, and at the end of vs. 23 to conceive the apodosis as suppressed: *If God, determined to show forth his wrath, bore with all long-suffering the vessels of his wrath, . . . also in order to make known the riches etc. . . . : what then? what shall we say?* (must not, then, all censure be silent?). The bearing of the σκεὴ δόξης is not merely regarded as a proof of his μακροθ., but, at the same time, as occasioned by the purpose of bringing to view the riches of his glory which he destined for the σκεὴ ἐλέους. The instant destruction of the σκεὴ δόξης (in this case the unbelieving Jews) would have been perfectly just; but God endured them with long-suffering (thus tempering his justice with kindness), both the aim and the result of this being the more striking display
 593 (by the contrast) of the greatness of his grace towards the σκεὴ
 531 ἐλέους. The δέ in vs. 22 is not οὖν, and hence the continuation of
 7th ed. the thought expressed in vss. 20, 21 is not probable. That God is perfectly free in bestowing the tokens of his grace, had been sufficiently stated. The creature cannot contend with the Creator, — that is enough. But, resumes Paul, God is not so rigorous as

he might be, and have no fear of the censure of men. [It is ⁵⁰⁴ probably still simpler, without supplying an apodosis, to take *εἰ* ... ^{6th ed.} *ἤνεγκεν* as the condition, and *καὶ* (sc. *ἤνεγκεν*) *ἵνα* vs. 23 as the conclusion: if God ... endured ..., he endured them *also* or *at the same time to the end that*, etc.] As to Acts x. 36 see above, § 62, 3 p. 564. On Rom. xii. 6 ff. see below, II. 1 p. 578. Col. i. 21 is in any event an anacoluthon, whether we read with Lchm. *ἀποκατηλλάγητε*, or with the text. rec. *ἀποκατηλλάξεν*. On 2 Pet. i. 17 see § 45, 6 b. p. 351, and on 1 Cor. xii. 2 Meyer.

In several other passages where expositors have thought they found an anacoluthon, I can discover nothing of the sort. Rom. vii. 21 *εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἔμοι ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἔμοι τὸ κακὸν παράκειται*, where according to Fr. (Conject. p. 50) there is a blending of two constructions, has by this scholar been subsequently explained otherwise, that is, in accordance with Knapp's view; see above, § 61, 5 p. 557. Likewise, in Heb. viii. 9 there is no blending of two constructions (Fr. Conject. p. 34). The quotation from the Sept. *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν* may be an unusual expression, but it is not incorrect. The form of the expression was unquestionably occasioned by the Hebrew (for it is a quotation from Jer. xxxi. 32) *יָמִים תְּחַוֶּיךָ בְּיָדָם*. The participle is used instead of the Infin., as in Jer. xxix. 2; cf. Bar. ii. 28. In 1 Pet. ii. 7 *ἀπειθοῦσι δέ* is grammatically connected with the words of the quotation, *οὗτος ἐγενήθη* etc. In Rom. i. 26, 27 a decision is difficult because the reading varies between *ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ* and *ὁμοίως τε καί*. The former appears to have more external evidence in its support; and Bornem. (neues theol. Journ. VI. 145) has preferred it (as well as Lchm.), and endeavored to vindicate it by the frequent recurrence of the expression in the N. T. Matt. xxvi. 35; xxvii. 41 (Mark xv. 31); Luke v. 10; x. 32; 1 Cor. vii. 3 f.; Jas. ii. 25, and also in Greek authors, as Diod. Sic. 17, 111. But as none of these passages is preceded by *τε*, they are inadequate; cf., however, the passage quoted by Fr. from Plat. symp. 186 e. *ἡ τε οὖν ἱατρικὴ ... ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ γυμναστική*. Grammatically, therefore, the reading supported by the most authoritative Codd. may be defended, and would even be very appropriate, as the Apostle obviously wishes to give the greater prominence to what was done by the *ἄρρενες* (he dwells on it in vs. 27, severely condemning the wickedness). Now comes the question whether either or both of these two readings causes an anacoluthon? With the reading *ὁμ. τε καί* [Cod. Sin.] there is no more an anacoluthon than in the Latin *nam et feminae ... et similiter etiam mares*. On the ⁵⁹⁴ other hand, if we read *ὁμ. δὲ καί* the natural sequence is broken, exactly as in Latin *et feminae ... similiter vero etiam mares*. Klotz, Devar. II. 532 740. In Heb. iii. 15 we must probably seek for the apodosis in vs. 16 ^{7th ed.} *τίνες γάρ* *quinam* etc., as Bleek, Tholuck, and others have done. In 2 Cor.

viii. 3 αἰθαίρετοι is connected with ἐαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν vs. 5. In 1 Cor. v. 11, in the words τῷ τοιούτῳ μὴδὲ συνεσθίειν we ought not with Erasmus to find an anacoluthon, but an intensive repetition of *συναναμίγν*. In Jas. ii. 2 ff. the anacoluthon disappears, if vs. 4 καὶ οὐ etc. be taken interrogatively, as is done now by most critics, and also by Lchm. Jno. xiii. 1 contains no grammatical anacoluthon; the difficulty must be disposed of hermeneu-
 505 tically. 1 Cor. ix. 15, if ἵνα before τις is spurious (Tdf. has restored it),
 64 ed. would be not so much an anacoluthon as an aposiopesis, see Mey. Lastly, in Eph. iii. 18 the participles are probably to be connected with the clause ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε etc., see Mey. in loc.

2. The anacolutha hitherto elucidated are of such a nature that they might occur in any language. But in Greek certain peculiar species of anacoluthon became established by usage, which must now be mentioned:

a. If a sentence is continued by means of participles, these, when at a distance from the governing verb, not unfrequently assume an abnormal case (see Vig. p. 337 sqq.; Rost 704), e.g. Eph. iv. 2 f. παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς . . . περιπατήσαι . . . ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ, σπουδάζοντες etc. (as if the exhortation were direct: περιπατήσατε), also i. 18 (where Meyer makes unnecessary difficulties); Col. iii. 16 ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς etc.; ii. 2 ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ etc. (as if παρακαλεῖσθαι were referred to the persons themselves), Col. ii. 10 [?]; 2 Cor. ix. 10 f. ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν . . . χορηγῆσαι καὶ πληθύναι τὸν σπόρον ὑμῶν . . . ὑμῶν, ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι etc.; vs. 12 f. ἡ διακονία (ἐστὶ) περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν, διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τ. διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν θεόν (as if ὅτι πολλοὶ εὐχαριστοῦσιν had preceded) cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 26. See also 2 Cor. i. 7; vii. 5; Phil. i. 29 f.; iii. 10; 2 Pet. iii. 3; Acts xxvi. 3; Jude 16. Cf. in general, Markland, Lys. p. 364, Reiske Vol. V.; Buttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 110; Seidler, Eurip. Iphig. T. 1072; Kühner II. 377 f.; Schwarz, soloecism. p. 89, also Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 135 sq. and sympos. p. 33. Some of the anacolutha of this sort may be considered as intentional. The
 595 thoughts when expressed by the Nom. of participles receive greater prominence; whereas the oblique cases merge them rather in the sentence as a whole (singularly so in Jude 16), and are marked as accessory. But most of them are occasioned by the author's having intended, in the preceding part of the sentence, to employ a different substantive, kindred in sense. Besides, cf. Evang. apocr. pp. 169, 445.

Of another sort are Mark xii. 40; Phil. iii. 18 f., on which see § 59, 8 b. 533 p. 532. In Rom. xiii. 11 *καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες* is connected with *ὀφείλετε* vs. 8; *τὸ αὐτὸ* and 1 Pet. ii. 16 connects itself, as the ideas suggest, with the Imperative *ὑποτάγητε* in vs. 13.

b. Frequently after a participle the construction passes over into a finite verb, which is apt to be accompanied by *δέ*; as, Col. i. 26 *πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων . . . νυνὶ δὲ ἐφανερώθη* instead of *νυνὶ δὲ φανερωθέν* (cf. Her. 6, 25; Thuc. 1, 67), 1 Cor. vii. 37 *ὃς ἔστηκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην, ἐξουσίαν δὲ ἔχει* (instead of *ἔχων*).¹ We must 506 not, with Meyer, refer to this head 1 Cor. iv. 14; nor Eph. ii. 3, ^{6th ed.} where *ἡμεν* is parallel to *ἀνεστράφημεν*. This transition occurs without *δέ* in Eph. i. 20 *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν . . . ἦν ἐνίργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν . . . καὶ ἐκάθισεν*, 2 Cor. vi. 9; Jno. v. 44; Col. i. 6 (Paus. 10, 9, 1). As to 2 Jno. 2 see below, II. 1 p. 578. An effort to attain a more simple structure, or to give prominence to the second thought (particularly in 2 Cor. vi. 9; cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 29), is not unfrequently the cause of such an anacoluthon. Heb. viii. 10 (from the O. T.) is to be explained thus: *αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ . . . διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς*. To render *καὶ* before *ἐπιγρ.* by *etiam*, as some (Böhme, for instance) do, is forced, and far from being favored by x. 16. As to Jno. i. 32 *τεθέσθαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον . . . καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν* (cf. vs. 33 *ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν*), the correct explanation has already been indicated by BCrus. Cf. also Schaef. Dion. H. p. 31 and Demosth. II. 75; V. 437, 573, also Plutarch. IV. 323; Blume, Lycurg. p. 147; Mtth. S. 1527 f. In the Codd. in such passages the participle is sometimes found as a correction, e.g. in Eph. as above, where Lchm. nevertheless has adopted *καθίσας* as genuine. A kindred sort of anacoluthon occurs in 2 Cor. v. 6 ff. *θαρρόντες οὖν πάντοτε . . . θαρρόμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν*, where Paul, after several intermediate clauses, repeats *θαρρόντες*, which he intended to construe with *εὐδοκ.*, in 596 the form of the finite verb.

c. A clause, which had begun with *ὅτι*, concludes with the (Acc. and) Infin., as if that particle had not been employed at all; as, Acts xxvii. 10 *θεωρῶ, ὅτι μετὰ ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας . . . μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν* cf. Plat. Gorg. 453 b. *ἐγὼ γὰρ εὖ*

¹ The case examined by *Hm.* Soph. El. p. 153, and *Buttm.* Demosth. Mid. p. 149, is different.

ἴσθ' ὅτι, ὡς ἑμαυτὸν πείθω, εἶπερ . . . καὶ ἐμὲ εἶναι τοῦτων ἕνα, see above, § 44, note 2, p. 339. On the other hand, in Aelian. 12, 39 the construction φασὶ Σερμίραμιν is founded on an Acc. with the 534 Inf., but is followed by μέγα ἐφρόνει, as if ὅτι had preceded. Similar 1th ed. is Plaut. Trucul. 2, 2, 62. With this may be compared also Jno. viii. 54 ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστὶ (where θεὸν ὑμῶν εἶναι might have been used). This, however, is rather to be considered as Attraction; see below.

d. The principal verb in the sentence does not regularly correspond to the Nominative or Acc. placed at the beginning of the sentence (*casus pendentes*, Wannowski, *Syntax. anomal.* p. 54 sq.; see, however, H. L.-Z. 1836. I. 338); as, 1 Jno. ii. 24 ὑμεῖς, ὃ ἡκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐν ὑμῖν μενέτω, and vs. 27 καὶ ὑμεῖς, τὸ χρίσμα ὃ ἐλάβετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει and you, the anointing, which . . . abides in you. In both passages, ὑμεῖς, if placed in the relative clause (Lchm.), would in that position of precedence be too emphatic. Luke xxi. 6 ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ etc. *these things which ye behold,— there will come days in which* (even to the last stone they will be 507 destroyed) *not a stone* (of them) *will be left on another*. So also 6th ed. in Jno. vi. 39; vii. 38; xv. 2; Matt. vii. 24; xii. 36; Rev. ii. 26; iii. 12, 21; vi. 8. Cf. Exod. ix. 7; Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 5; Oec. 1, 14; Ael. 7, 1. 2 Cor. xii. 17 μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; for, *have I sent to you any one of those etc. in order to defraud you?* Rom. viii. 3 τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει . . . ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας . . . κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, *what to the law was impossible . . . God condemned, sending his Son, sin in the flesh, for, that God did, and condemned etc.* Here, however, τὸ ἀδύν. may also be regarded as a predicate placed before a proposition complete in itself, and may be resolved ὃ γὰρ ἀδύνατόν ἐστι, like Heb. viii. 1 κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ὑρχιερέα etc. see § 32, 7 p. 231; cf. Kühner II. 156.

Several critics, Olsh. among them, have supposed that there is an Accus. absol. (?) in Acts x. 36 τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ etc. *the* 597 *word, which* (or which word) *he sent first to the children of Israel* (namely, the word vs. 35 ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει etc.). Yet see § 62, 3 p. 564.

An *anacoluthon* peculiar to the N. T. sometimes occurs, where the writer proceeds in the words of an O. T. statement instead of in his own, e.g. Rom. xv. 3 καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαντῷ ἤρρεσεν, ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδίζοντων σε ἐπέπυσαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ (instead of — but, to please

God, he submitted to the cruelest reproaches) vs. 21; ix. 7; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9; iii. 21; Heb. iii. 7. Yet see below, § 64, 7 p. 598.

e. Under the head of anacoluthon comes also the use of μέν without a subsequent parallel clause (made prominent by δέ), Hm. Vig. 841 sq. In this case either

α) the parallel member is easily to be supplied from the clause with μέν, being in a manner included in it, as in Heb. vi. 16 *ἄνθρωποι μέν γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ὁμνίουσι* *men swear by the greater*, but God can swear only by himself, cf. vs. 13 (Plat. Protag. 334 a.), 535 yet this μέν is doubtful [and wanting also in Cod. Sin.]; Col. ii. 23 ^{7th ed.} *ἅτινά ἐστι λόγον μέν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν ἐθελοθησκείᾳ καὶ* etc. *which, indeed, have an appearance of wisdom*, but in fact are not (Xen. An. 1, 2, 1), Rom. x. 1, where perhaps Paul purposely avoided the painful antithesis (which is brought out in vs. 3 but softened by a compliment), see further 1 Cor. v. 3. Cf. Xen. Hier. 1, 7; 7, 4; Mem. 3, 12, 1; Plat. Phaed. 58 a.; Aristoph. pax 13; see Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 105; Held, Plutarch. A. Paull. p. 123. Or

β) the antithetic member is evidently added, but in another construction; as, Rom. xi. 13 f. *ἐφ' ὅσον μέν σὺν εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἔθνων ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω, εἰπὼς παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα* etc. Here the clause with δέ lies wrapt up in εἰπὼς παραζ., instead of Paul's writing regularly: *inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify mine office* (preaching zealously to the Gentiles), *but I have in this the benefit of the Jews in view* (I will thus render the Jews emulous), I am, indeed, in fact an apostle to the Gentiles, but at the same time in purpose an apostle to the 508 Jews. Or ^{6th ed.}

γ) the construction is entirely broken off, and the parallel clause must be gathered by the reader from the sequel, e.g. Acts i. 1 *τὸν μέν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων . . . ἀνελήφθη*. Now the writer ought to proceed: *and the history from this point of time* (the Ascension) *I will narrate now in the second part of my work*; but by the mention of the apostles vs. 3 he is led to refer to Christ's appearance after his resurrection, and connects immediately with this the continuation of the narrative. Rom. vii. 12 *ὥστε ὁ μέν νόμος* 598 *ἅγιος καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ὁγία καὶ δίκαια καὶ ἀγαθή* *the law, indeed, is holy, and the commandment is holy* etc. but *ἁμαρτία*, made active in the *σὰρξ*, misuses it (in the way indicated vs. 8). This thought the Apostle brings out in vs. 13 by a different turn of expression. Cf. further, Rom. i. 8; iii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 18 (in all these cases *πρῶτον μέν*, see below), Heb. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 12 (see Rück. in loc.), Acts

iii. 13; xix. 4 (in the last passage *μὲν* is not fully established), xxvi. 4. Instances in Greek writers are, Eurip. Orest. 8; Xen. C. 2, 1, 4; 4, 5, 50; Mem. 1, 2, 2; 2, 6, 3; Plato, Apol. 21 d.; Reisig, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 398; Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 225 and many others. In Luke viii. 5 ff.; Jno. xi. 6; xix. 32; Jas. iii. 17 the correlative particle is not entirely omitted, only for *δέ* we find sometimes *ἔπειτα* (Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 133; Schaef. melet. p. 61), sometimes *καί*; and that even in Greek authors *μὲν ... ἔπειτα, μὲν ... καί* (Thuc. 5, 60 and 71), *μὲν ... τε* are used correlatively, is well known, and not strange, cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 230; Matthiae, Eurip. Orest. 24; Baiter, ind. ad Isocr. paneg. p. 133; Weber, Demosth. 257; Maetzner, Antiph. pp. 209, 257. Sometimes the clause with *δέ* is somewhat remote, as in 2 Cor. ix. 1, 3 (Thuc. 2, 536 74), probably also in 1 Cor. xi. 18 (see just below); or as respects 7th ed. expression is not completely parallel, as in Gal. iv. 24, 26.

Rom. i. 8 *πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ* etc. is unquestionably an anacoluthon. The Apostle when he used this phrase had in mind a *δύτερον* or *εἰτα*, which, however, in consequence of a change in the thought does not follow. The remark of Wytttenbach (Plut. Mor. I. 47, ed. Lips.) is applicable here: si solum posuisset *πρῶτον*, poterat accipi pro *maxime, ante omnia* (so it is rendered by nearly all expositors); nunc quum *μὲν* addidit, videtur voluisse alia subjungere, tum sui oblitus esse. Cf. also Isocr. Areopag. p. 344; Xen. M. 1, 1, 2; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 142; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 191. In 1 Cor. xi. 18 *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ συνερχομένων ὑμῶν* etc., *ἔπειτα δέ* is probably implied in vs. 20 ff.; and Paul properly meant to write: In the first place, I hear that when ye come together there are divisions among you, and further, that irregularities occur at the Lord's Supper. Paul conceives the latter from a different point of view than the divisions. Rom. iii. 2 Tholuck has already correctly explained.

Likewise in Matt. viii. 21 *ἐπίτραφόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι* etc. 509 there is nothing corresponding to *πρῶτον*; yet we, too, say: let me *first* 7th ed. (in the first place) go and bury, — whereupon every one readily supplies according to the context: I will then return (and follow thee, vs. 19, 22). When in the combination *τε ... καί* a *πρῶτον* is inserted after *τε*, as in Rom. i. 16; ii. 9 f., it means *primarily, chiefly*. In 2 Cor. viii. 5, too, 599 *πρῶτον ... καί* does not stand for *πρῶτον ... ἔπειτα*; see Mey.

An anacoluthon similar to that with *μὲν* occurs sometimes with *καί* where it ought to have been repeated (*as well ... as also*). Thus in 1 Cor. vii. 38 *ὥστε καὶ ὁ ἐγαμίζων καλῶς ποιᾷ, ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐγαμίζων κρείσσον ποιᾷ* the sentence is strictly speaking so laid out that *καὶ ὁ μὴ ... καλῶς ποιᾷ* ought to follow. But Paul, while intending to express himself thus, corrects himself and employs the comparative, and then the adversative particle appears more appropriate. There is, however, weighty evidence against *δέ*; and

it may have been introduced by transcribers for the reason just mentioned, instead of the original *καί*

II. 1. Different from anacoluthon is the *oratio variata* (Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 22; Jacobs, Aelian. p. 6; Bremi, Aeschin. II. 7; Mtth. 1530 ff.). It takes place when, in parallel sentences and members of sentences, two (synonymous) constructions have been adopted, each of which is complete in itself—*heterogeneous* structure. It occurs in accurate writers particularly when the continuance of the previous construction would have been heavy, obscure, or not quite suited to the thought (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. 254; Beier, Cic. off. II. 38); sometimes, also, regard for variety of expression has had influence.

We subjoin, in the first place, some instances of a simple description: 1 Jno. ii. 2 ἵλασμός περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου (where, either instead of the last words the writer might have used περὶ τῶν ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, or instead of the first, περὶ ἡμῶν), similar 537 are Heb. ix. 7; Acts xx. 34 (1 Kings iii. 1; iv. 30; Lucian. parasit. 7th ed. 20); Eph. v. 33 καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἓνα ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν, ἥ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φόβηται τὸν ἄνδρα (cf. § 43, 5, and Jno. xiii. 29); Eph. v. 27 ἵνα παραστήσῃ ἑαυτῇ ἐνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσιν σπῖλον . . . ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾗ (ἡ ἐκκλησία) ἁγία κ. ἄμωμος,¹ cf. Acta apocr. p. 179; Phil. ii. 22 ὅτι, ὡς πατρὶ τέκνον, σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *that, as a child a father, he served (me in my apostolic calling, more appositely) with me* etc., Rom. iv. 12 (Ael. an. 2, 42); Luke ix. 1; i. 73 f.²; Rom. i. 12; cf. Mtth. 1529 f.; Schwarz, soloec. p. 89 sq.; 1 Cor. xiv. 1 ζηλοῦτε τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε (where Paul might have written τὸ προφητεύειν), cf. vs. 5 and vs. 11; Rev. iii. 18; 600 Acts xxii. 17.

The following are bolder: Mark xii. 38 f. τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς (ἀσπάζεσθαι) ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς etc.; 510 Jno. viii. 53 μὴ σὺ μελίων εἰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ὅστις 6th ed. ἀπέθανε; καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον, where the regular construction required the continuation of the interrogative form: καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, οὔτινες ἀπέθ. ; 1 Cor. vii. 13 γυνή, ἥτις ἔχει ἄνδρα

¹ Jno. xi. 52 (ἡμελλεν ἀποθῆσκειν) οὐχ ὅτι τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα . . . συναγάγῃ εἰς ἓν does not come under this head. There was here no more convenient mode of expression for the second clause.

² On the other hand, in Luke i. 55 the words τῇ Ἀβραάμ etc. belong to *μνησθῆναι ἐλπίδων*, especially on account of *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*.

ἀπιστον καὶ οὗτος συνευδοκεῖ (καὶ συνευδοκοῦντα) οἰκεῖν μετ' αὐτῆς, μὴ ἀφίετω αὐτόν, see above, p. 150 ; cf. similar instances in Luke xvii. 31 and Jno. xv. 5. In Rom. xii. 6 sq. ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν . . . εἴτε προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, εἴτε διακονίαν ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει the construction (Acc. governed by ἔχοντες) is kept up only as far as ἐν τῇ διακ., then commences a new construction with concretes, for which Paul might have written εἴτε διδασκαλίαν . . . παράκλησιν etc. In 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. Paul enumerates the sufferings attendant on the apostolic calling, by which he had proved himself to be the servant of Christ, and that in no ordinary degree. First, ἐν κόποις περισσοτ. etc. is simply appended, each particular is enhanced by an adverb of degree, then follow narrative Aorists and Perfects vs. 24 f. ; Paul then returns to substantives with the instrumental Dative and the instrumental ἐν by turns, vs. 26, 27. See, further, Jno. v. 44 ; Phil. i. 23 f. ; 1 Jno. iii. 24.

The alteration in the construction is manifestly intentional; namely, for the purpose of bringing out the thought more forcibly than would have been done by a uniform structure, in 2 Jno. 2 διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.¹ Also in Rom. ii. 9 sq. the first time (in reference to 538 misery) ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν is used, the second time (in reference 7th ed. to salvation) the more appropriate personal Dative. The oratio variata occurs in connection with an ellipsis, in 2 Cor. viii. 23 ; Rom. ii. 8 ; xi. 22 and Mark vi. 8 παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδὲν αἰρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν . . . ἀλλ' ὑποδεδεμένους σκανδάλια (sc. πορεύ 601 εσθαι) καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι (here ἐνδύσησθε is the better reading) δύο χιτῶνας, see Fr. in loc. In Rom. xii. 2 we should probably read the Inf. συσχηματίζεσθαι, and not the Imperat. συσχηματίζεσθε.

¹ Mark ii. 23 can hardly, with Fr., be brought under the head of *variatio structurae*, if measured by the standard of cultivated prose: ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν . . . διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ μαθηταὶ etc. for ἄρξασθαι τοὺς μαθητάς. The latter construction would be too heavy for the narrative style of the Evangelists. Besides, ἐγένετο stands in no necessary relation to ἄρξασθαι τοὺς μαθ. (as if, it came to pass that, as he . . . , the disciples plucked ears) ; but Mark meant : It came to pass, that he went through the grain fields on the Sabbath-day, and (then) the disciples plucked etc. Still less can I perceive in 1 Cor. iv. 14 ; Eph. ii. 11-13 or even in Phil. i. 13 any remarkable alteration of the construction. No writer expresses himself with such painful nicety as never to say, *I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved children I warn you*, instead of, *not to shame you . . . but . . . to warn*. But in Acts xxi. 28 (Fr. conject. I 42 sq.) *ἔτι τε* shows that Luke wished to give prominence to what follows, and hence the independent construction of this new clause.

From Greek authors many similar instances might be adduced. Thus Paus. 1, 19, 5 τοῦ Νίσου λέγεται θυγατέρα ἐρασθῆναι Μίνω καὶ ὡς ἀπέκειρε τὰς τρίχας τοῦ πατρός, 5, 1, 2; 8, 22, 4 Πείσανδρος δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Καμυρεὺς ἀποκτείνει τὰς ὀρνίθας οὐ φησὶν, ἀλλὰ ὡς ψόφῳ κροτάλων ἐκδιώκειεν αὐτάς. Thuc. 8, 78; Xen. M. 2, 7, 8; Hell. 2, 3, 19; Anab. 2, 5, 5; Aelian. anim. 10, 13. As to Mark xii. 38f. cf. especially Lys. caed. Eratosth. 21. From the Sept. may be quoted Gen. xxxi. 33; Judg. xvi. 24; 3 Esdras iv. 48; viii. 22, 80; 511 Neh. x. 30. In Mark iii. 14 ff., with the principal words ἐποίησε ^{6th ed} δώδεκα, ἵνα etc. vss. 14, 15, which are complete in themselves, is connected first the detached statement vs. 16 καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι etc. in reference to the chief apostle, then follow in vss. 17–19 the names of the rest in direct dependence on ἐποίησεν, and only in vs. 17 is subjoined a similar statement, which no more breaks the flow of the discourse than in vs. 19 ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν etc. does. The whole structure would be regular had Mark said in vs. 16 Σίμονα, ᾧ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα etc.

Under this head comes also the transition from a relative construction to a personal, as in 1 Cor. viii. 6 εἰς θεὸς . . . ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, 2 Pet. ii. 3 οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαισι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, Rev. ii. 18, see above, p. 149; Weber, Demosth. p. 355 sq. Essentially similar is Luke x. 8 εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε, καὶ δέχωνται (οἱ πολῖται) ὑμᾶς etc.

On Rev. vii. 9 εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος . . . ἐστῶτες . . . περιβεβλημένους, cf. xiv. 14, see above, § 59, 11 p. 535. Both passages contain a blending of two constructions, as in Rev. xviii. 12 f., where are appended to τὸν γόμον first appositive Genitives, then an Acc. (πᾶν ξύλον), afterwards (κ. ἵππων etc.) Genitives again, lastly (ψυχὰς ἀνθρ.) another Acc. On the 539 other hand, in ii. 17, in accordance with the proper distinction of cases, ^{7th ed} the first a Gen. and then an Acc. are made to depend on δώσω.

2. Moreover, the transition (very frequent in Greek prose authors) from the oratio obliqua to the recta, and vice versa, deserves special attention (d'Orville, Charit. p. 89 and 347; Heind. Protag. p. 510 sq.; Jacobs, Aelian. p. 46, 475; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 160; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 451; Bornem. Xen. Mem. p. 253; Fr. Marc. p. 212): Acts xxiii. 22 ἀπέλυσε τὸν νεανίαν παραγγείλας μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι, ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς με, vss. 23, 24 εἶπεν· ἐτοιμάσατε . . . κτήνη τε παραστήσαι, Luke v. 14 παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ 602 μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον, Mark vi. 9; cf. Xen. Hell. 2, 1, 25; An. 1, 3, 14 and the passages from Joseph. in Kypke I. 229 sq.; Mark xi. 31 sq. ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· διατί οὖν

οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ ; ἀλλ' εἶπωμεν· ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ; ἐφοβοῦντε τὸν λαόν (where the narrator proceeds in his own words). With Acts i. 4 cf. Lysias in Diogit. 12 ἐπειδὴ δὲ συνήλθομεν, ἤρετο αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή, τίνα ποτὲ ψυχὴν ἔχων ἀξιοῖ περὶ τῶν παίδων τοιαύτη γνώμη χρῆσθαι, ἀδελφός μὲν ὢν τοῦ πατρός, πατὴρ δ' ἐμός etc. (Geopon. 1, 12, 6). See also Jno. xiii. 29 ; Acts xvii. 3 ; on the other hand, in Matt. ix. 6 the narrator intercalates τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ among the words of Christ, cf. Mark ii. 10 ; Luke v. 24. This explanation is the simplest. Meyer is artificial.¹

512 A transition from the Sing. to the Plur., and vice versa, occurs in Rom. 6th ed. iii. 7 f. ; xii. 16 ff. 20 ; 1 Cor. iv. (2) 6 f. (Aelian. 5, 8) ; 2 Cor. xi. 6 ; Jas. ii. 16 ; Gal. iv. 6 f. (vi. 1) ; Schweigh. Arrian. Epict. II. I. 94, 278 ; Matthiae, Eurip. Orest. 111 ; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 106 ; Schwarz, soloec. 107. Likewise Rom. ii. 15 ἐν τ. καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροῦντος αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως may be referred to this head. The transition from the Sing. to the Plur. in Luke v. 4 is intentional, see Bornem. in loc. As to the Plur. in apposition with a Sing. in 1 Jno. v. 16 see § 59, 8 p. 530.

A heterogeneous appositive construction occurs in Rev. i. 6 ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ, see § 59, 8. So also in other constructions the Greek authors sometimes place concretes and abstracts in juxtaposition, see Bremi, Aeschin. Ctesiph. § 25 ; Weber, Demosth. 260. Cf. also Caes. civ. 3, 32 erat plena *licitorum et imperiorum* provincia.

540 § 64. DEFECTIVE STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES ; ELLIPSIS,²
7th ed. APOSIOPESIS.
603

I. The erroneous and variable notions about Ellipsis (and Pleonasm) current until very recently, and derived from the uncritical compilations of L. Bos³ and his followers (cf. Haab p. 276 ff.), and of N. T. philologists in particular, were first cor-

¹ Matt. xvi. 11 πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε, οὗτοι οὐ περὶ ἔργων εἶπον ὑμῶν· προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ζήμης τῶν φαρισαίων etc. is of a different sort, as here only the direct words of Jesus, used in vs. 6, are as such repeated. Likewise Jno. x. 36 contains nothing remarkable.

² See K. F. Krumbholz, de ellipsis in N. T. usu freq. in his operar. subseciv. lib. I. Norimb. 1736. 8vo. no. 11 ; F. A. Wolf, de agnitione ellipsis in interpretatione libror. sacror. Comment. I-XI. Lips. 1800-1808. 4to. (Comm. I.-VI. have been reprinted in Pott, Sylloge commentt. theol. IV. 107 sqq. ; VII. 52 sqq. ; VIII. 1 sqq.), an uncritical collection. Cf. besides, Bauer, Philol. Thucyd. Paull. 162 sqq. ; Bloch, on the Ellipses in Paul's Epistles, in his Theologian Part I. (Odensee 1791).

³ Lamb. Bos, Ellipses graecae. Francq. 1712. 8vo. ; Traj. ad Rh. 1755. 8vo. ; ed. C. Schoettgen, 1713, 1728. 12mo. ; ed. J. F. Leisner, Lips. 1749, 1767. 8vo. ; ed. N. Schwebel, Norimb. 1763 ; c. nott. C. B. Michaelis, Hal. 1765. 8vo. ; c. prior. editor. suisq. observatt. ed. G. H. Schaefer, Lips. 1808. 8vo. (reprinted at Oxford 1813. 8vo.), cf. Fischer, Weller. III. I. 119 sqq. ; III. II. 29 sqq.

rected, and sound views established, by Herm. de ellipsi et pleonasmo in Wolf and Buttmann's *Mus. antiq. studior.* Vol. I. fasc. I. pp. 97–235, and in Herm. *Opusc.* I. 148–244, and especially in his notes on Vig. 869 sqq.¹ We shall mainly follow him in this discussion, which, however, is primarily intended merely to lay down the various classes of ellipses, since Glassius and Haab have already accumulated examples in great abundance.²

1. Ellipsis (not including Aposiopesis, to be treated under No. II) consists in the omission of a word the meaning of which must be supplied in thought (in order to complete the sentence).³ The omission of such a word (whether out of convenience or an effort to be concise)⁴ is allowable only when, in what is uttered, an indubitable intimation of the omitted word is given (*Hm. opusc.* p. 218), either by means of the particular structure of the sentence or by virtue of a conventional usage.⁵ In accordance with the three constituent parts of every simple sentence, such omissions may be arranged under the three main classes of Ellipses of the Subject, of the Predicate, and of the Copula (*Hm. Vig.* 870 sq.). A real i.e. entire ellipsis of the *predicate*, however, does not, and probably cannot, occur (*Hm. Vig.* 872), since the possible predicates are too various for the speaker to leave this part of his sentence to be supplied by the reader. Accordingly there remain but the other two sorts of ellipses, and those of the subject are naturally the more limited.

The case in which a word or phrase of a preceding clause must be repeated in a subsequent connected clause, either unchanged or altered to suit the construction (*Glass.* I. 632 sqq.), cannot be called an ellipsis, there being here no actual omission of the word (*Hm. Vig.* 869; *Opusc.* 151 sq.; *Poppo, Thuc.* I. I. 282).⁶ Examples:

¹ Ellipsis in Latin is discussed by *J. W. Schlickeisen*, de formis linguæ latinæ ellipticis. Mühlhausen, 1830 and 43. two Pr. 4to. An earlier work of *J. G. Lindner* on Latin Ellipses (Frkf. a. M. 1780. 8vo.) is of little value even as a collection of examples.

² How much the books of Scripture have been compelled to suffer from expositors in the matter of Ellipsis *Hm. Opusc.* p. 217 intimates, when he terms these books, *cereos flecti quorundam artibus.*

³ *Hm. opusc.* p. 153: ellipses propria est ratio grammatica, quæ posita est in eo, ut oratio, etiamsi aliquid omissum sit, integra esse censeatur, quia id, quod omissum est, necessario tamen intelligi debeat, ut quo non intellecto sententia nulla futura sit.

⁴ The omission of a word may also sometimes arise entirely or partly from a rhetorical cause. See below, no. 3.

⁵ Neither of these can, for instance, be shown by those expositors who, to get over the historical difficulty in *Jno.* xviii. 31, would supply *hoc die* (festo) in connection with *ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποκτείνειν οὐδέν.*

⁶ It must not be overlooked that this mode of expression gives style greater periodic

- a. 2 Cor. i. 6 εἶτε θλιβόμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν σωτηρίας sc. θλιβόμεθα (v. 13; vii. 12); Luke xxii. 36 ὃ ἔχων βαλλάντιον, ἀράτω ... ὃ μὴ ἔχων sc. βαλλάντιον (κ. πήραν), Jas. ii. 10; Jno. iv. 26; xii. 28 δόξασον σοῦ τὸ ὄνομα ... καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω sc. τὸ ὄνομά μου. Cf. also Rom. iii. 27; viii. 4; xi. 6; xiii. 1 (αἱ δὲ οἶσαι sc. ἐξουσίαι, which but few authorities add),¹ Jno. iv. 53; Acts xxiii. 34; 1 Cor. vii. 3 f.; xi. 25 (cf. vs. 23); xv. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 11; Rev. ii. 9. So especially in answers: Jno. xviii. 5 τίνα ζητεῖτε; ...
- 514 Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, vs. 7; Luke xx. 24 τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφὴν; ¹⁴ ed. ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· Καίσαρος, vii. 43; Matt. xxvii. 21; Heb. v. 4 οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν, ἀλλὰ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τ. θεοῦ sc. λαμβάνει τ. τιμ. (but λαμβ. in the sense of *receive*).
- 605 b. Mark xiv. 29 εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ (σκανδαλισθήσομαι, cf. Matt. xxvi. 33); Eph. v. 24 ὥσπερ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω ... αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν (ὑποτασσέσθωσαν); 2 Tim. i. 5 ἦτις ἐνώκησεν ἐν τῇ μάμμῃ σου ... πέπεισμαι δέ, ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί (ἐνοικεῖ); Rom. xi. 16 εἰ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα (ἅγιον); Heb. v. 5 ὁ Χρ. οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν ... ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτὸν (ἐδόξ. αὐτόν); 1 Cor. xi. 1 μιμηταί
- 542 μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς καὶ γὰρ Χριστοῦ (μιμητῆς εἰμι); xiv. 27 εἶτε γλώσση τις ¹⁴ ed. λαλεῖ, κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς (λαλεῖτωσαν), cf. 1 Pet. iv. 11; Luke xxiii. 41 ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ· καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως (ἐσμέν sc. ἐν τῷ κρίματι τούτῳ); 1 Cor. ix. 12, 25; xi. 16; 2 Cor. iii. 13 καὶ οὐ καθάπερ Μωϋσῆς ἐτίθει κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἑαυτοῦ (τίθεμεν καλ. ἐπὶ τὸ πρ. ἡμῶν),² cf. besides Matt. xx. 23; xxvi. 5; Jno. xiii. 9; xv. 4, 5; xvii. 22; xviii. 40; Rom. i. 21; ix. 32; xiv. 23; Phil. ii. 5; iii. 4; Heb. (ii. 13) v. 5; x. 25; xii. 25; Rev. xix. 10; Matt. xxv. 9. Under this head comes also 1 Cor. vii. 21 δοῦλος ἐκλήθης, μή σοι μελέτω, if, as is most natural, τῆς δουλείας be supplied (Lob. paralip. p. 314); see Meyer, who has overlooked the fact that even in my fifth edition I made this suggestion. The greatest accumulation of such indispensable repetitions occurs in Rom. xii. 6 ff.

c. Neither is there any real ellipsis when an affirmative word is to be supplied from a foregoing negative, — a case of frequent occurrence in Greek authors (e.g. Thuc. 2, 98, 3 πορευομένη αὐτῷ ἀπεγίνετο μὲν οὐδὲν

compactness; whereas the repetition of the same or a similar expression in most cases be very heavy.

¹ 1 Jno. iii. 20 also would, according to *Lücke's* exposition, come under this head, as γινώσκωμεν (οἶδαμεν) is supplied before the second ὅτι, vs. 19. I confess, however, that to me this explanation seems very forced. Why might not a transcriber have added, from inadvertence, a second ὅτι? Lchm. has with A rejected the second ὅτι. But it may just as well have been omitted because it was not understood. Or why may not the author himself have repeated the ὅτι, as in Eph. ii. 11 f.? see *Fr. Progr. ad Gal. p. 5* (*Fritzschiorum* opusc. p. 236). The passage has never yet been satisfactorily explained.

² This case, in which the verb is construed, not with the principal subject, but with the subject of the secondary clause, may be regarded as a sort of attraction, see *Kröyer, gramm. Untersuch.* III. 72, who at the same time adduces many similar examples, as *Xen. C. 4, 1, 3; Thuc. 1, 82; 3, 67.*

τοῦ στρατοῦ εἰ μὴ τι νόσος, προσεγίγνετο δέ, see Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 78; sympos. p. 80, and Euthyd. p. 158; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 176, on the Lat. cf. Bremi, Nep. p. 345; Kritz, Sallust. II. 573); as, 1 Cor. vii. 19 ἡ περιτομή οὐδέν ἐστι, ἀλλὰ τήρησις ἐντολῶν θεοῦ (ἐστὶ τι οὐ τὰ πάντα ἐστί), iii. 7; 1 Cor. x. 24 μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητείτω, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου sc. ἑαυτοῦ. Otherwise in Eph. iv. 29; 1 Cor. iii. 1. Frugality of expression is carried still farther in Mark xii. 5 καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους, τοὺς μὲν δέροντες, τοὺς δὲ ἀποκτείνοντες, where from these two Participles a finite verb is to be borrowed that combines both verbal notions, — such as *maltreat* (cf. Fr. in loc.). Also in Rom. xiv. 21 καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον, μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει etc., after the second μηδέ, the general word ποιεῖν (Aristot. Nicom. 8, 13, 6), or such an expression as *make use of*, is probably to be supplied. As to Phil. ii. 3 see below, p. 587 (Lob. paralip. p. 382). In Heb. x. 6, 8 ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας the general notion θυσίας is to be deduced from ὁλοκ. for περὶ ἁμ., as in Heb. x. 38 the general term ἄνθρωπος is to be gathered from δίκαιος (cf. Kühner II. 37). In Rev. vi. 4 we must abstract from λαβ. τ. εἰρ. ἐκ τῆς γῆς the concrete οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπ' αὐτῆς as a subject for σφάξουσιν. Yet here, too, the omission is but partial. (For examples of all the preceding cases from Latin, see Lindner, lat. Ellipsis. S. 240 ff.) At the same time, in all these cases the incompleteness of the sentence (viewed grammatically and logically) renders it obviously necessary to supply something. This is not the case in Jno. viii. 15 ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε, ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα, where on the contrary the second clause is so concluded by οὐδένα that nothing whatever requires to be supplied: *ye judge according to the flesh, but I judge no one* (not merely, no one according to the flesh, but absolutely no one). To supply κατὰ τὴν σάρκα from the foregoing clause could only be justified by incongruity in the sense without such addition. This, however, I am as unable to discover as Olshausen and Lücke. On the meaning, see especially BCrus. in loc.

After εἰ δὲ μὴ ἢ εἰ δὲ μὴ γε (Matt. vi. 1; Luke x. 6; xiii. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 16 etc.; cf. Plat. Gorg. 503 c.; Phaed. 63 c.; Hoogeveen, partic. gr. I. 345 sq.), and after the expression (current with Paul) οὐ μόνον δέ (... ἀλλὰ καὶ), it is peculiarly common to supply a preceding word or phrase; as, Rom. v. 3 οὐ μόνον δέ (sc. καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης vs. 2), ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα etc., v. 11 καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ... οὐ μόνον δέ (καταλλαγέντες σωθησ.), ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι, viii. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 19. In Rom. ix. 10 οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ῥεβέκκα etc. something to be gathered from a more distant part of the context appears to be wanting. It is easiest to supply it from vs. 9; cf. vs. 12: *and* (not only) *Sarah received a divine promise respecting her son*, but also Rebecca, who was yet the mother of two legitimate sons, etc. In Greek cf. Diog. L. 9, 39 πεντακοσίοις ταλάντοις τιμηθῆναι, μὴ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαλκαῖς εἰκόσι. Lucian. vit. auct. 7 οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἦν θυρωρεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπιστήσης, πολὺ

πιστοτέρῃ χρήσῃ τῶν κυνῶν, Toxar. 1 (Kypke, obs. II. 165 ; Hoogerveen, partic. II. 956). Analogous is the expression οὐ μόνον γὰρ . . . ἀλλὰ used by earlier authors, e.g. Plat. Phaed. 107 b. οὐ μόνον γὰρ, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης (sc. ἀπιστίαν σε δὲ εἶχειν περὶ τῶν εἰρημάνων), ἀλλὰ ταῦτά τε εὐ λέγεις etc., Meno 71 b. ; legg. 6, 752 etc., see Heind. and Stallb. Plat. Phaed. as above. The clause after οὐ μόνον δέ is (by repetition) expressed in 2 Cor. vii. 7. Also the use of κἀν, in the sense of *vel certe* (Vig. 527 ; Boisson. Philostr. epp. p. 97), is referable to an omission, e.g. Mark vi. 56 ἵνα κἀν τοῦ κρασπίδου . . . ἀψωνται (properly ἵνα ἀψωνται αὐτοῖς, κἀν τοῦ κρασπίδου ἀψωνται), 2 Cor. xi. 16, as also εἰ καὶ in 2 Cor. vii. 8 cf. Bengel in loc.

Still less is it to be considered as an ellipsis when, in one and the same principal clause, a word used only once is to be supplied twice (in different phrases) : Acts xvii. 2 κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς τῷ Παύλῳ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτοὺς (Παῦλος), xiii. 3 ἐπιθάτες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν (αὐτοὺς). In Rom. ii. 28 οὐχ ἔν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαϊὸς ἐστὶν οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ περιτομή the predicative Ἰουδαῖος and περιτομή must be supplied also to the subject ἔν τῷ φαν. Cf. further Acts viii. 7.

- 607 Note. It may sometimes happen that a word is to be supplied in the preceding from the *subsequent* context (Hm. opusc. 151 ; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 109 ; Lindner, lat. Ellips. S. 251 ff.), cf. 1 Cor. vii. 39. But in 516 Rom. v. 16 to supply παραπτώματος after ἐξ ἑνός from ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων may now be regarded as out of date, see Philippi in loc. And in 2 Cor. viii. 5 ἔδωκαν serves, as usual, also for the clause beginning with καὶ οὐ, only with the latter it must be taken absolutely : *and they did not give as (in extent) we hoped, but their own selves gave they* etc. Only in Mark xv. 8 ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς δὲ ἐποίει αὐτοῖς it may seem as if it were necessary to supply ποιῶν after αἰτεῖσθαι, from ἐποίει ; but the words 544 properly run : *to entreat according as he always did for them*, from which 7th ed. the object of request may be gathered, but not grammatically supplied. As to Eph. iv. 26, however, where some would supply μή from the second member also in the first, see p. 311.

2. The most frequent real omission is that of the simple copula εἶναι :

a. In the form ἐστί, more rarely in the form ᾗ (yet cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 133), because it is obviously suggested by the juxtaposition of subject and predicate (Rost 473 f. ; Krü. 240 f. ; cf. Wannowski, syntax. anom. p. 210 sq.) Heb. v. 13 πᾶς ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος ἀπειρος (ἐστί) λόγου δικαιοσύνης, ix. 16 ; x. 4, 18 ; xi. 19 ; Mark xiv. 36 ; Rom. xi. 16 ; xiv. 21 ; 2 Cor. i. 21 ; Phil. iv. 8 ; Eph. i. 18 ; iv. 4 ; v. 17 ; 2 Thess. iii. 2 ; 1 Pet. iv. 17, particularly in questions Luke iv. 36 ; Acts x. 21 ; Rom. iii. 1 ; viii. 27, 31 ; 2 Cor. ii. 16 ; vi. 14 ; Rev. xiii. 4 ; Heb. vi. 8 (cf. Kritz, Sallust. I. 251) and exclamations Acts xix. 28, 34 μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις

Ἐφεσίῳ, but especially in certain set forms of expression Jas. i. 12 μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὅς etc. (Matt. v. 3, 5-10; xiii. 16; Luke i. 45; Rom. iv. 8; xiv. 22; Rev. xvi. 15; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 14), δῆλον ὅτι 1 Cor. xv. 27; 1 Tim. vi. 7, ἀνάγκη with Infin. Heb. ix. 16, 23; Rom. xiii. 5, πιστὸς ὁ θεός 1 Cor. i. 9; x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 18 or πιστὸς ὁ λόγος 1 Tim. i. 15; iii. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 11, ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς Phil. iv. 5, ἄξιός ἐστι ἐργάτης τ. τροφῆς Matt. x. 10; 1 Tim. v. 18 cf. Rev. v. 2, ἔτι μικρόν Jno. xiv. 19, μικρόν ὅσον ὅσον Heb. x. 37, εἰ δυνατόν Matt. xxiv. 24; Rom. xii. 18; Gal. iv. 15, ὥρα with Infin. Rom. xiii. 11 (Plat. ap. p. 42), τί γάρ Phil. i. 18; Rom. iii. 3, τί οὖν Rom. iii. 9; vi. 15, τί ἐμοί κ. σοί Mark v. 7; i. 24; Luke viii. 28; Jno. ii. 4 (Her. 5, 33; Demosth. aphob. 564 b.; Arrian. Epict. 1, 1, 16; 2, 19, 16), τί τὸ ὄφελος 1 Cor. xv. 32; Jas. ii. 14, 16, ὃ ὄνομα or ὄνομα αὐτῷ, where the name follows, Luke ii. 25; Jno. i. 6; iii. 1, etc. (Demosth. Zenoth. p. 576 b.), cf. besides Acts xiii. 11; ii. 29. In the latter, as in the former, brevity and compactness are in place, cf. Vig. p. 236.¹ The Subjunctive ᾗ is to 608 be supplied after ἵνα in (Rom. iv. 16) 2 Cor. viii. 11, 18.

b. More rarely is the substantive verb omitted in other forms: as εἰμί 2 Cor. xi. 6 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει (λογίζομαι μηδὲν ὑστερεῖν τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων precedes),² εἰσί Rom. iv. 14; xi. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 8; i. 26 (see Mey.); Rev. xxii. 15; Heb. ii. 11 (Schaeff. melet. p. 43 sq.), ἐσμέν Rom. viii. 17; 517 2 Cor. x. 7; Phil. iii. 15 (Plin. epp. 6, 16), εἰ Rev. xv. 4 (Plat. ⁶⁴ Gorg. 487 d.), ἔστω Rom. xii. 9; Col. iv. 6; Heb. xiii. 4, 5 (Fr. Rom. III. 65) also after χάρις τῷ θεῷ Rom. vi. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 16; ix. 15 (Xen. A. 8, 3, 14), εἴη in wishes Rom. i. 7; xv. 33; Jno. xx. 19, 21, 26; Matt. xxi. 9; Luke i. 28; Tit. iii. 15. Two different forms of this verb are omitted at the same time in Jno. xiv. 11 ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί, xvii. 23. In 545 narration the Aorist also is suppressed, e.g. 1 Cor. xvi. 9 (Xen. ⁷⁴ An. 1, 2, 18; Cyr. 1, 6, 6; Thuc. 1, 138, etc.). On the Future see p. 586. In all cases in the simple diction of the N. T. it is easy (in Greek authors it is frequently more difficult, see Schaeff. melet. p. 43 sq. 114) to perceive from the connection what words are to be supplied. Hitherto, however, expositors have been very lavish of their ellipses of the substantive verb, and have in par-

¹ Under this head comes also the phrase τί (ἐστὶ) ὅτι Mark ii. 16; Acts v. 4 (Bar. iii. 10); Fr. Mr. p. 60.

² More simply in Mark xii. 26 Sept. ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ Acts vii. 32. Also 2 Cor. viii. 23. Cf. Soph. Antig. 634.

ticular transformed in this way a multitude of Participles into finite verbs, cf. § 45, 6 p. 350.

Likewise the Imperative plural *ἐστέ*¹ is, according to the whole tone of the sentence, omitted in passages such as Rom. xii. 9 (1 Pet. iii. 8); and to explain the Participle *ἀποστνγούντες* by an anacoluthon is unnecessary. With *εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός* etc. Rom. ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3 we must supply, not *ἐστί* (Fr. Rom. I. 75), but (cf. 1 Kings x. 9; Job i. 21) *εἶη* or *ἔστω*.

Likewise, where *ἐστί* etc. is more than a mere copula, where it denotes *existence, permanence*, it is sometimes wanting (Rost 474) 1 Cor. xv. 21 *δι' ἀνθρώπου ὁ θάνατος* (exists) vs. 40; Rom. iv. 13.

It is thus sufficient to supply *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι* even in most of those passages where an oblique case or a preposition seems to require a more definite verb; as, 1 Cor. vi. 13 *τὰ βρώματα τῇ κοιλίᾳ καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασι*, Acts x. 15 *φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν (ἐγένετο, cf. vs. 13)*, Matt. iii. 17 (Jno. xii. 28 *ἦλθεν φωνή*),² 1 Cor. iv. 20 *οὐκ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει* (cf. ii. 5), Rom. x. 1; xi. 11; 2 Cor. iv. 15; viii. 13 (Mey.), 1 Pet. iii. 12; Heb. vii. 20. The preposition or case suggests the particular verbal notion to be supplied: (whose final doom) *leads to burning, is destined for, results in*, etc. As in the last passage *ἐγένετο* is obviously sufficient, so in the first and second, in accordance with the simplicity of the style, nothing more than *ἐστί* is to be supplied. The same applies to 1 Cor. v. 12 *τί γάρ μοι καὶ τοὺς*
 518 *ἔξω κρίνειν*; (Arrian. Epict. 2, 17, 14 *τί μοι νῦν τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους*
 6th ed. *μάχην παραφέρειν*; 4, 6, 33) and Jno. xxi. 22 *τί πρὸς σε*; (see Hm. opusc. p. 157 sq. 169; Bos, ellips. p. 598; cf. the Latin *hoc nihil ad me, quid hoc ad me*, Kritz, Sallust. II. 146). Also in
 546 Jno. xxi. 21 *οὗτος δὲ τί; ἔσται (γενήσεται)* is sufficient. The
 7th ed. connection points to a Future. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 17. Lastly, under this head comes the expression *ἵνα τί* sc. *γένηται* or *γένοιτο*, Hm. Vig. 849.

¹ Mey. thinks that *ἐστέ* is to be supplied also in Eph. i. 13 after *ἐν* *φ*. But this *ἐν* *φ* seems rather to be taken up again after the clause *ἀκούσαντες* etc. in the second *ἐν* *φ*. For *εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ* can hardly be introduced between *ἀκούσαντες* and *πιστεύσαντες*.

² What is suppressed is always that which is the most simple; and although here and there in a phrase elsewhere elliptical a writer inserts a specific verb, it does not follow that this very verb is the verb to be supplied. Thus Antipater, in the Greek Anthology, says: *εἰ τί τοι ἐκ βίβλων ἦλθεν ἐμῶν ὄφελος*. Yet we must not on that account, with Palaiet p. 415, supply *ἦλθε* in the phrase *τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος*, but merely the simple *ἐστί*. In the same way, in Lucian. merc. cond. 25 we find *τί κοινὸν λόγος καὶ ὄν*; but it does not follow from this that *κοινόν* must be supplied in the phrase *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*; see Fr. Mr. p. 33.

Verbs which express the predicate (or a part of it) as well as the copula (Hm. p. 156 sq.) can be suppressed only when some intimation of them is given in the structure of the sentence (Bar. iv. 1). Cf. the familiar phrases *Twelve for a dollar*, *manum de tabula*, *haec hactenus*, etc. Thus in Acts ix. 6 rec. ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν it is easy to supply εἶπε (vs. 15), which is suggested in πρὸς αὐτόν, as in ii. 38; xxv. 22 (Aelian. 1, 16 var.).¹ In Rom. iv. 9 ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀκροβυστίαν; the meaning is obviously: *does it have reference to* etc.; yet we must supply, not πίπτει with Theophylact, but rather λέγεται (Fr. in loc.), cf. vs. 6 (λέγειν εἰς τινα Eurip. Iphig. T. 1180). Acts xviii. 6 τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν, Matt. xxvii. 25 τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς (2 Sam. i. 16; Plato, Euthyd. 283 e.) sc. ἐλθέτω cf. Matt. xxiii. 35 (though ἔστω is sufficient).² In Rom. v. 18 ὡς δι' ἐνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα supply ἀπέβη impersonal: *res cessit, abiit* in etc., and in the following οὕτω καὶ δι' ἐνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς 610 δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, (according to vs. 19) ἀποβήσεται (Fr.); or rather ἀπέβη also (Mey.). In 2 Cor. ix. 7 ἕκαστος, καθὼς προήρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ ἐκ λύπης, supply δότω, suggested by the whole context. In Luke xxii. 26 ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, the word ποιήσετε, inferred from κυριεύουσιν etc., is most naturally to be supplied; perhaps even ἔσεσθε might suffice. But in Phil. ii. 3 with μηδὲν κατὰ ἐρίθειαν it is enough to repeat φρονούντες. In Gal. ii. 9 δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς μὲν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν, since the passage relates to preachers of the gospel, we may readily supply εὐαγγελιζόμεθα, εὐαγγελίζονται (2 Cor. x. 16, like κηρύττειν εἰς τινα 1 Thess. ii. 9), and not with Fr. and Mey. the less significant πορευθῶμεν, πορευθῶσιν etc. In Rev. vi. 6 the complement of the cry, χοῖνιξ σίτου δηναρίου καὶ τρεῖς χοίνικες κριθῶν δηναρίου *a measure of wheat for a denarion!* is as obviously suggested by the Genitive of price (p. 206), as in similar forms of expression with us. As to the epistolary forms of salutation in Rev. i. 4 Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, Phil. i. 1 Παῦλος πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις . . . τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλιππίοις 519

6h ed.

¹ This ellipsis has a wide range in Greek and Latin, e.g. Charit. 6, 1 ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες, Val. Flacc. 5, 254 *vix ea*. Cf. also Cic. N. D. 2, 4, 11 *augures rem ad Senatum*, and many similar instances especially in the epistolary style, Cic. fam. 4, 8; 7, 9; Attic. 15, 8 and 17; 16, 9, particularly ad Attic.

² In Greek authors also, when similar imprecations occur, e.g. ἐς κεφαλὴν σοι Aristoph. pac. 1063, *τραπέσθω* is usually supplied (see Bos p. 657 sq.), agreeably to Mosch. 4, 123; Phalar. ep. 128.

547 sc. *χαίρειν λέγει*, or Acts xxiii. 26 *Κλ. Δυσίας τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι*
 7th ed. *Φήλικι χαίρειν* sc. *λέγει*, xv. 23 ; Jas. i. 1, see Fr. Rom. I. 22.

In the proverb 2 Pet. ii. 22 *ὅς λουσαμένη εἰς κύλισμα βορβύρου*, the requisite verb is implied in *εἰς*, and *ἐπιστρέψασα* may easily be supplied, conformably to what precedes. But it is precisely in proverbs, where brevity of expression is necessary, that specific verbs are (by conventional usage) suppressed, cf. *γλαῦκ' εἰς Ἀθήνας*, *fortuna fortes*, and Bhdy. p. 351. Grotefend, *ausf. lat. Gramm.* II. 397 f.; Zumpt, *lat. Gramm.* p. 610.

3. The *subject* is *wholly* wanting (Krü. 232) only,

a. When it is self-evident ; because the predicate, owing to the nature of the case or to conventional usage, can refer to but *one* (definite) subject, e.g. *βροντᾷ (ὁ Ζεὺς)*, *σαλπίζει (ὁ σαλπιγκτής)*, *ἀναγνώσεται* (Demosth. Mid. 386 b.) sc. *scriba*, see above, § 58, 9 p. 521 sq. From Jewish phraseology may be included under this head the formulas of quotation *λέγει* Heb. i. 7, *εἶρηκε* iv. 4, *φησί* viii. 5 (vii. 17 rec. *μαρτυρεῖ*), see above, § 58, 9 p. 522. As to Heb. xiii. 5 see Bleek.

b. When an expression is introduced the subject of which is at once supplied by every reader's knowledge or memory ; as, Jno. vi. 31 *ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν* sc. *ὁ θεός*, 2 Cor. ix. 9 (Ps. cxii. 9) ; 1 Cor. xv. 27 (but in vs. 25 the subject is *Χριστός*), Col. i. 19 ; Jno. xii. 40 ; xv. 25 ; Rom. ix. 18 f. ; see v. Hengel, Cor. p. 120 sq. As to Jno. vii. 51 see p. 523. On 1 Tim. iii. 16 see a few lines below ; and as to Matt. v. 38 see below, no. 6 Remark, p. 598.¹

Nothing is omitted when the third person Plur. is used impersonally, as in Jno. xx. 2 *ἦραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τῶ μνημείου* (cf. § 58, 9 p. 522) ; for the general subject, *people* or *men*, is properly speaking already contained in the person. See also Luke xii. 20 and Bornem. in loc. The same applies to the Gen. Absolute, as in Luke viii. 20 *ἀπηγγέλη αὐτῷ λεγόντων* i.e. *they saying*, cf. 1 Kings xii. 9 ; 1 Chron. xvii. 24 ; Thuc. i. 3 ; Xen. C. 3, 3, 54 ; Diog. L. 6, 32 ; Doederlein, *Soph. Oedip. Col.* p. 393 ; Valcken. Herod. p. 414 ; Schaef. *Demosth.* V. 301.

In 1 Tim. iii. 16, according to the reading *ὅς*, the subject to the relative clauses that follow would be wanting, unless, with recent editors, we begin the apodosis with *ἔδωκε*. But that is unadvisable on account of the parallelism. It is more likely that all these members are co-ordinate, and that the apostle took them from some hymn (as such were in use even in the

¹ Sometimes when the subject is omitted a rhetorical reason has influence, inasmuch as it is concealed out of disappointment and vexation. To this might perhaps be referred Rom. ix. 19 and 2 Pet. iii. 4 (see *Gerhard*).

apostolic church), and suppressed the subject, familiar to every one, all the more readily because he was concerned here only with those predicates which involved the *μυστήριον*. (As to the simple *αὐτός* in reference to a well-known subject, see § 22, 3 p. 146.) On 1 Cor. vii. 36, see § 67, 1. ^{7th ed.}

Under a. come also Heb. xi. 12 *διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἐνὸς ἐγεννήθησαν*, where the term *children* (*descendants*) is readily supplied, and indeed is already implied in *γενῶσθαι* (cf. Gen. x. 21); and Rom. ix. 11 *μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων μηδὲ πραξάντων*, where, moreover, the notion of *τέκνων* or *υἱῶν* is sufficiently intimated in *Ῥεβέκκα ἐξ ἐνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα* etc. vs. 10. In Luke xvi. 4 the subject is *the debtors*, cf. vs. 5.

When the subject is not omitted, but has to be repeated from the context (not Heb. viii. 4), there is room sometimes for a difference of opinion, as in Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 25 (Heb. ix. 1). The decision in such cases is not grammatical, but hermeneutical.

4. On the other hand, often but a part of the subject or of the predicate (if it consists of something besides the copula, see above, no. 2) is expressed; and the portion omitted is to be supplied from what is expressed in accordance with conventional usage; as, Acts xxi. 16 *συνῆλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν* *there came also at the same time* (*some, τινές*) *of the disciples*; with *ἐκ* or *ἀπὸ* in Luke xi. 49 *ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσι* (*τινάς*), xxi. 16; Jno. xvi. 17; xxi. 10; vi. 39; 612 Rev. ii. 10 (v. 9); xi. 9,¹ cf. p. 203; Heindorf, Plat. Gorg. p. 148; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaestion. Lucian. 201; Jno. iv. 35 *ὅτι ἐτι τετράμηνός ἐστι* (*χρόνος*), Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 9; Luke xii. 47 f. *ἐκείνος ὁ δοῦλος . . . δαρήσεται πολλὰς . . . ὀλίγας* cf. 2 Cor. xi. 24. The notion of *stripes* is implied in *δέρειν*; accordingly *πληγὰς* is readily suggested (and this elliptical phrase is of frequent occurrence in Greek authors, Xen. A. 5, 8, 12 *τοῦτον ἀνέκραγον ὡς ὀλίγας παῖσειν*, Aelian. anim. 10, 21 *μαστιγοῦσι πολλὰς*, Aristoph. nub. 971; Schol. ad Thuc. 2, 39 (*οἱ πλεόνας ἐνεγκόντες*), cf. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 737; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 433; Valcken. ad Luc. l.c., and something similar in Bos under *αἰκισμα*, (cf. also the German: *er zählte ihm zwanzig auf, he counted him out twenty*).

The ellipsis is carried still further in 2 Cor. viii. 15 *ὁ τὸ πολὺ οὐκ ἐπλεόνασε, καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἡλαττόνησε* (from Exod. xvi. 18 cf. vs. 17), where *ἔχων* may be supplied. Later writers employ this idiom (the Article with an Accusative) in various forms, e.g. Lucian. Catapl. 4 *ὁ τὸ ξύλον*, Bis Acc. 9 *ὁ τὴν σύρυγγα*, dial. m. 10, 4 (Bhdy. 119), and it has been as fully sanctioned by usage in their case as in the case of the phrases specified above. See

¹ Some have infelicitously applied this ellipsis to Jno. iii. 25.

Bos, ellips. p. 166. Some expositors infelicitously apply it to Matt. iv. 15. In Rom. xiii. 7 ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τὸν φόρον, τὸν φόρον etc. the most natural ellipsis is ἀποδιδόναι κελεύοντι i.e. ἀπαιτοῦντι. In 1 Cor. iv. 6 ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθῃτε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἀ γέγραπται, if we reject φρονεῖν as spurious, an Infin. is wanting (per ellipsin, not as Mey. maintains [in his earlier eds. ; but not so in the 4th.] per aposiopesis) ; it will be sufficient to supply the
 549 general expression : *to go beyond* what etc., to exalt yourselves.
 1th ed. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. x. 13 ὑπὲρ δὲ δύνασθε nothing is to be supplied ; the verb is used absolutely, as *posse* often is in Latin. Luther correctly renders the passage : *über euer Vermögen*, (above that ye are able).

521 In 1 Pet. ii. 23 παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως some supply κρίσω from
 6th ed. κρίνοντι, which in itself is not impossible ; yet παρεδίδου probably is here, as often, to be taken reflexively : *he committed himself* (his cause) *to him that judgeth righteously*. There is no ellipsis whatever in Matt. xxiii. 9 πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *call not* (any man) *your father on the earth*, i.e. do not employ on the earth, i.e. among and of men, the appellation "our father ;" and 1 Tim. v. 9 χήρα καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἑλαττον ἐτῶν ἐξήκοντα γεγονυῖα etc. is : *as a widow let no one be enrolled who is less than*
 613 *sixty years of age* ; widows entered on the list are, according to vs. 16, those who received support from the funds of the church.

5. It is common, in particular, to omit substantives in certain fixed phrases or in special contexts, and to express their adjectives merely, which latter of themselves conduct the mind to the substantives, cf. Bhdy. 183 ff. Examples :

ἡμέρα (Bos under the word) in the expressions, ἡ ἐβδόμη Heb. iv. 4 (of the Sabbath), ἕως or μέχρι τῆς σήμερον Matt. xxvii. 8 ; 2 Cor. iii. 15 (2 Chron. xxxv. 25 ; Malal. 12, 309, generally in the Sept. and the N. T. ἡμέρας is added), ἡ αὐριον Jas. iv. 14 ; Matt. vi. 34 ; Acts iv. 3, 5 (3 Macc. v. 38), ἡ ἐξῆς Acts xxi. 1 ; Luke vii. 11, τῇ ἐχομένῃ Luke xiii. 33 ; Acts xx. 15, τῇ ἐπιούσῃ Acts xvi. 11, τῇ ἐτέρᾳ (postridie) Acts xx. 15, τῇ τρίτῃ Luke xiii. 32 (Xen. C. 5, 3, 27 ; Plut. paedag. 9, 26 τὴν μέσῃν τέμνουν).¹

ὁδός (Fischer as above, 259 sq. ; Lob. paralip. p. 363) : Luke xix. 4 ἐκείνης ἡμέλλε διέρχεσθαι, v. 19 μὴ εὐρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν (Cic. Att. 9, 1 qua ituri sint, Cic. divin. 1, 54, 123).²

¹ In Acts xix. 38 ἀγόραιοι ἔγονται (Strab. 13, 629) most expositors supply ἡμέραι, which is quite appropriate.

² The local meaning of the Gen. *that way* (cf. Germ. *des Wegs*) is questioned by Bornem. Luc. p. 37, 118, who wants to read in the two passages ποίᾳ, ἐκεῖνῃ ; yet *Hm.*

iii. 5 ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείας etc. (where, however, in the second member *οδοὺς* follows) cf. Lucian. dial. m. 10, 13 εὐθείαν ἐκείνην προϊόντες, Paus. 8, 23, 2, Lat. compendiariâ ducere Senec. ep. 119, rectâ ire.¹

ὕδωρ (Bos p. 501 sq.): Matt. x. 42 δὲ ἐὰν ποτίσῃ . . . ποτήριον 550
ψυχροῦ, Jas. iii. 11; Epict. ench. 29, 2; Arrian. Epict. 3, 12, 17 ^{7th ed.}
and 15, 3; Lucian. mors Peregr. 44, just as we say: *a glass of* 522
port, a bottle of sherry, etc. We find also θερμόν sc. ὕδωρ Aristoph. 614
nub. 1040; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 71, etc. So in Latin *frigida* Plin.
ep. 6, 16, *calida* Tac. Germ. 22, *gelida* Hor. serm. 2, 7, 91.

ἱμάτιον (Bos p. 204 sq.): Jno. xx. 12 θεωρεῖ δύο ἀγγέλους
ἐν λευκοῖς καθεζομένους *in white garments*, Matt. xi. 8; Rev.
xviii. 12, 16; cf. Sept. Exod. xxxiii. 4; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 10
ἐν κοκκίνοις περιπατῶν and Wetst. I. 381, 958; Bos p. 204.

γλῶσσα: Rev. ix. 11 ἐν τῇ ἑλληνικῇ.

αὔρα (Bos p. 49; cf. Lob. paralip. p. 314): Acts xxvii. 40
ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμονα τῇ πνεύσει cf. Lucian. Hermot. 28,
(similarly τῷ πνέοντι sc. ἀνέμῳ Lucian. Char. 3).

χώρα (Bos p. 560 sq.): ἐξ ἐναντίας *ex adverso* Mark xv. 39,
which is used likewise in a figurative sense Tit. ii. 8. The same
word is usually supplied in Luke xvii. 24 ἡ ἀστραπή ἡ ἀστράπτουσα
ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει (Sept. Job xviii. 4;
Prov. viii. 28). ἡ ὄρεινῃ Luke i. 39 early became a substantive,
the highlands, the hill country, Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 3; Ptol. Geogr.
5, 17, 3; 6, 9, 4.

ὥρα *time*, is regarded as omitted in the phrase ἀφ' ἧς 2 Pet.

Vig. p. 881 found no fault with this local Gen. which became established in the Pro-nominal adverbs οὗ, τοῦ. And many instances of this very phrase τῆς (αὐτῆς) οὐδοῦ (cf. *Bhdy.* 138) are cited, and that not merely from poets (*Krü.* Sprachl. II. 2. S. 157); cf. in particular, Thuc. 4, 47, 2 and *Krü.* on the passage, and Thuc. 4, 33, 3. If any one wishes to bring this local Gen. nearer to the primary import of the Gen. (§ 30, 1), he may take it perhaps thus: *out or forth from that (way)*. But probably it connects itself more simply with the use mentioned in § 30, 11 p. 207.

¹ Many adverbial expressions arose from an ellipsis of ὁδός (*Bttm.* ausf. Sprachl. II. 341) or χώρα (Bos p. 561), such as ἰδίᾳ, κατ' ἰδίαν, δημοσίᾳ Acts xvi. 37 etc., which no longer suggest to the mind their origin, *Bhdy.* 185 f. Such an adverbial expression also is ἀπὸ μιᾶς Luke xiv. 18, which cannot be discovered in the literary language of the Greeks, but was probably current in the language of conversation. It is equivalent to *with one mind* (ἐκ μιᾶς ψυχῆς Dion. H. II. 1058) or *with one voice* (uno ore, ἐκ μιᾶς φωνῆς Herod. 1, 4, 21). *Wahl*, clav. p. 45, after *Camerar.* is too artificial. It is possible, moreover, that the Greeks did not understand any substantive at all originally, but employed the Feminine (as an abstract, *Ewald*, Heb. Gr. 645), just as independently as the Neuter, see *Schaefer*. Bos p. 43 and the Review in the *L. Lit. Zeit.* 1825. no. 179; this, however, *Hm.* opusc. p. 162 will not admit.

iii. 4; Luke vii. 45; Acts xxiv. 11, which, indeed, had already become completely an adverb (cf. however, Matt. xv. 28). The same applies to *ἐξ αὐτῆς* Mark vi. 25; Acts x. 33 etc., which many write as one word, *ἐξαιτῆς*.

δόμος (or *οἶκος*) Acts ii. 27, 31 *εἰς ἄδου*, cf. Bos p. 14; Vechner, Hellenol. p. 124 sq., but the best Codd. [Sin. also] give *εἰς ἄδην*.

γῆ: Matt. xxiii. 15 *ἡ ξηρά* (opposed to *ἡ θάλασσα*) the *continent*, *dry land* (Kypke in loc.). The same substantive would have to be supplied in Heb. xi. 26 *οἱ ἐν Αἰγύπτου θησαυροί* (Lchm.). Cf. Her. 8, 3; Diod. S. 12, 34. But the reading *οἱ Αἰγύπτου θησαυροί* [which Cod. Sin. also gives] is better supported.

χεῖρ in *ἡ δεξιὰ, ἡ ἀριστερά* Matt. vi. 3 etc., *δεξιὰν διδόναι* Gal. ii. 9 (Xen. A. 1, 6, 6; 2, 5, 3), *ἐν δεξιᾷ, ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν* Eph. i. 20; Matt. xxvii. 29.

δραχμή: Acts xix. 19 *εἶρον ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε*, as we say: *he is worth ten thousand*. Cf. Lucian. eun. 3 and 8; Achill. T. 5, 17. So also the names of measures are omitted Ruth iii. 15.

ύετός: Jas. v. 7 *μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ (καρπῷ), ἕως λάβῃ πρῶτον καὶ ὀψιμον*.

The ellipsis in all these expressions has been sanctioned by long usage, and for that very reason is plain, especially in particular contexts, to all who are familiar with the language (cf. *he put down red, he sat on the right, he came in a coach and six*). Other omissions are more special (peculiar to the *usus loquendi* of a city or community), e.g. *προβατική* (*πύλη* Neh. iii. 1) Jno. v. 2 (just as they say in Leipsic, to go out at the Grimma), yet see Bos under the word *πύλη*. Such also are *οἱ δώδεκα, οἱ ἑπτά (διάκονοι)* Acts xxi. 8; cf. in Greek *οἱ τριάκοντα (τύραννοι)*.

523 To this head have been referred incorrectly many expressions and phrases in which an adjective or neuter pronoun is used independently without any ellipsis (Krü. S. 3). e.g. *τὸ ἱερόν* (which at an early period had become a substantive) *the temple*, *τὸ διοπετές* Acts xix. 35, *τὸ σημερινόν* Rev. xviii. 12, in biblical diction *τὸ ἅγιον the holy place* (in the tabernacle and the temple), *τὸ ἰλαστήριον* etc., *τὰ ἴδια one's own* (possession) Jno. i. 11, *τὰ σά what is thine* Luke vi. 30, *τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς* Eph. iv. 9 (where, however, good Codd. [Sin. also] add *μέρη*), *τὸ τρίτον τῶν κτισμάτων* Rev. viii. 9 etc., and the adverbial expressions *ἐν παντί, εἰς κενόν, τὸ λοιπόν* (§ 54, 1). Likewise in Heb. xiii. 22 *λόγων* is not to be supplied after *βραχέων*, any more than *verbis* or the like is to be understood after *paucis*, or (in quotations) *τόπῳ* after *ἐν ἐτέρῳ* Acts xiii. 35; Heb. v. 6. Also in 1 Cor. xv. 46 *τὸ πνευματικόν* and *τὸ ψυχικόν* are used as substantives, and *σῶμα* is not to be understood. Lastly, with *ἐν τῷ μεταξύ* Jno. iv. 31 *χρόνῳ* is not to be supplied, but *τῷ*

μεταξύ is the Dat. of τὸ μεταξύ (Lucian. dial. d. 10, 1). Even the Gen. of *kindred*, such as Σώπατρος Πύρρον Acts xx. 4, 'Ιουδας 'Ιακώβου, Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Συχέμ (§ 30, 3), is not elliptical, but the Gen. expresses the general notion of *belonging to*, just as we say: *Prussia's Blücher* (Hm. opusc. p. 120; Kühner II. 118 f.). For instances from Greek and Roman authors, see Vechner, Hellenol. p. 122 sq.; Jani, ars poet. p. 187 sq. But even were υἱός, ἀδελφός, and the like, actually omitted in such expressions, it would still be a complete perversion to supply υἱός before the Genitive in Gal. iii. 20 ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἐνός οὐκ ἔστιν, (Kaiser de apologet. ev. Joa. consiliis II. 8). A word can be omitted only when the notion it expresses is conveyed by the context, or may be presumed to be known to the reader. But when it is said: the mediator is not of *one*, the expression does not even remotely intimate that precisely the word *son* is to be supplied. The sentence by itself merely means: *does not appertain to a single individual*. And that he appertains to him as *son* (instead of what surely must be regarded as most obvious, in his very function of mediator) is left wholly to conjecture!

On the other hand, a number of (transitive) verbs have, in a similar way, rid themselves in the course of time of the case of the noun in union with which they formed a current phrase, and are now used all alone to express the same meaning, e.g. δάγειν *to live* (in an ethical sense) Tit. iii. 3, strictly, to spend sc. τὸν βίον 552 1 Tim. ii. 2. So frequently in Greek authors, Xen. C. 1, 2, 2; 7th ed. 8, 3, 50; Diod. S. 1, 8. Similarly, διατρίβειν *sojourn* in a place 616 Jno. iii. 22, strictly, *spend* sc. τὸν χρόνον, see Kühnöl in loc. Cf. in Latin *agere, degere* (Vechner, Hellenol. p. 126 f.). Συμβάλλειν *τινί* or *πρός τινα* Acts iv. 15; xvii. 18 *to confer, consult with one*, originally συμβάλλειν λόγους *sermonem conferre* Ceb. 33; by the older Greeks chiefly in the Mid. συμβάλλεσθαι. Προέχειν *τινί* *pay attention to etc.*, sc. τὸν νοῦν, cf. in Latin *advertere, attendere*. Similar is ἐπέχειν Luke xiv. 7; Acts iii. 5. So perhaps also ἐνέχειν Mark vi. 19; Luke xi. 53, where, however, it is sometimes explained *to be angry*, supplying χόλον (Her. 1, 118; 6, 119); but no instance can be found of the suppression of *this* Acc. Ἐπι- 524 τιθέναι *τινί* (τὰς χεῖρας) Acts xviii. 10; cf. Xen. M. 2, 1, 15; Cyr. 6th ed. 6, 3, 6. Συλλαμβάνειν, concipere, *to become pregnant* Luke i. 31. Many verbs when used thus by themselves have become technical terms, as e.g. διακονεῖν Jno. xii. 2 *to serve at table*, προσφέρειν Heb. v. 3 *to offer*, προσκυνεῖν *to worship* Jno. xii. 20; Acts viii. 27, λατρεύειν Phil. iii. 3; Luke ii. 37; Acts xxvi. 7, καλεῖν *invite* 1 Cor. x. 27 (Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 23; 8, 4, 1), κρούειν *knock* (at a door) Matt. vii. 7 etc., προβάλλειν *to put forth* (of trees), a

horticultural term, Luke xxi. 30. Nautical terms are *αἶρειν* *weigh* sc. *τὰς ἀγκύρας* Acts xxvii. 13 (Bos p. 15) Thuc. 2, 23, like the Latin *solvere* Caes. gall. 4, 23, and *κατέχειν εἰς* Acts xxvii. 40, see Wahl under the word.

- ~ We must, however, be careful not to refer to this head such verbs as either contain in themselves a complete notion, or in a given context are intended to express nothing more than the action which they denote, and are used absolutely, as *ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν* *to be pregnant*, *διорύσσειν* *to break through, to break in* Matt. vi. 19, *στρωννύειν ἐαυτῷ sibi sternere* Acts ix. 34 *to make one's bed*, *ἀποστέλλειν* *to send* (personally or by letter) Luke vii. 19; Acts xix. 31 (Vechner, Hellenol. p. 126), *μὴ ἔχειν* *to be poor* 1 Cor. xi. 22; Boisson. Philostr. epp. p. 128 (*habere* Jani, ars poët. p. 189), *ἀγοράζειν καὶ πωλεῖν* Rev. xiii. 17. [Just so in *ἀποκτενεῖτε* etc. Matt. xxiii. 34 the actions expressed are conceived absolutely; see Mey. ad loc.] For examples of verbs used abstractly, see e.g. 1 Cor. iii. 1; x. 13; Heb. xii. 25; Col. ii. 21; Phil. ii. 12; Jas. iv. 2f. As to *πάσχειν* in particular, see Wahl, clav. p. 387; cf. Weber, Demosth. p. 384. Also Luke ix. 52 ὥστε *ἐτοιμάσαι αὐτῷ* is probably to be rendered: *to prepare for him*, what? appears from the context, and *ξενίαν* from Philem. 22 is not to be supplied. In the same way the verbs are used in 1 Cor. xi. 4 *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων* (cf. 2 Cor. v. 12) and Rev. xxii. 19 *ἐάν τις ἀφέλῃ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου*, where to supply *τι* betrays an utter want of philological discernment. Lastly *δύνασθαι*, used absolutely, signifies *to be able*, have power, and* does not require an Infinitive to complete its sense, not even in 1 Cor. x. 13 (where *δύν. ὑπενεγκεῖν* follows immediately) cf. Rom. viii. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 8.
- 553 (Substantives with the Article are also used thus technically in doctrinal terminology, and with them a Gen. of the Person —
- 617 *θεοῦ* — has been looked for; as, *ἡ ὀργή* Rom. iii. 5; v. 9; xii. 19; 1 Thess. i. 10; ii. 16, *τὸ θέλημα* Rom. ii. 18.)

Adjectives used attributively with substantives can be omitted only in very rare instances. It is quite conceivable, for example, that in the phrase *λαλεῖν ἐτέρας* or *καυαῖς γλωσσαῖς* the adjective was dropped through frequent use, and that *γλωσσαῖς λαλεῖν* alone became a technical expression (de Wette on Acts, S. 33). But beyond the range of local and individual usage (somewhat like *libri*, namely Sibyllini, or *bishop in partibus* for in part. *infidelium*) nothing of this sort occurs; since, owing to the diversity of epithets that may be joined to a substantive, it would not do to leave the reader to guess the precise one to be supplied. In 2 Pet. ii. 10 *ὅτι οὗτοι σαρκὸς πορεύεσθαι* does not need to be completed by *ἐτέρας* from Jude 7;

the phrase is intelligible as it stands. In 1 Cor. vi. 20 *ἡγοράσθητε τιμῆς* the epithet *μεγάλης* is not omitted, but the words mean simply: *ye have been bought with a price*; the emphasis lies upon the verb *bought*, not obtained for nothing. In Matt. xii. 32 *ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* we must not supply *βλάσφημον*; *to speak a word against one*, is a phrase complete in itself. In Rev. ii. 6, also, the rendering *hac* (laudabile) *habes* does not assume the omission of some similar word in the Greek. A more plausible instance would be Acts v. 29 *ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι*, i.e. *οἱ ἄλλοι* or *λοιποὶ ἀπ.* and the like; yet on this see above, § 58, 7 note, p. 520 sq.

It would be preposterous also to supply, for instance, *ἓνα* in Matt. xv. 28 ⁵²⁵ *οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον* or *ἐνί* in Luke vii. 7 *εἰπὲ λόγῳ*, or *τωνῶν* in Mark ⁶⁴ *ii. 1* *δὲ ἡμαρῶν* (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 440), or even *πολύν* in Luke xviii. 4 *ἐπὶ χρόνον*. The notion of *one* is contained in the Singular, and that of *several* in the Plural. Cf. Lucian. Herm. *ταλάντων* for *one talent*, and eun. 6 *ἡμέραν* *unum diem* (in Latin, ut verbo dicam), Lucian. Alex. 15 *ἡμέρας οὐκοι ἔμεινεν*, Xen. Eph. 5, 2; Charit. 5, 9. With Luke xviii. in particular, cf. the well-known *χρόνῳ* Schoem. Isae. p. 444.

Note. It would be the most absurd of all to admit the existence of an ellipsis of adverbs or conjunctions; and yet this has been done in a variety of cases by N. T. expositors. Of such interpreters Hm. opusc. p. 204 says: *qui si cogitassent, adverbia conjunctionesque proprietatibus quibusdam et sententiarum inter se consociationibus ac dissociationibus indicandis inservire, quae nisi disertim verbis expressae vel propterea intelligi nequeant, quod, si ellipsi locus esset, etiam aliena intelligi possent: numquam adeo absonam opinionem essent amplexi, ut voculas, quarum ommissio longe aliter quam adjectio sententias conformat, per ellipsin negligi potuisset crederent*. But ignorance of the nature of the moods is in part at the bottom of this opinion. Thus with *θέλεις εἰπῶμεν* Luke ix. 54; Heb. viii. 5, etc. some have wanted to supply a *ἵνα* or *ὅπως*, (see in opposition Hm. p. 207, cf. § 41, 4 b. p. 285); so also *εἰ* or *εἰάν* in sentences like 1 Cor. vii. 21 ⁵⁵⁴ *δοῦλος ἐκλήθης, μὴ σοι μελέτω* (Hm. p. 205; cf. § 60, 4 c. p. 541); so *ἂν* ⁷⁴ *αὖ* (Schwarz, soloec. p. 125) in Jno. xv. 22 *εἰ μὴ ἦλθον . . . ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον* ⁶¹⁸ and similar sentences (Hm. p. 205, see § 42, 2 p. 303 sq.); and so *μόνον* frequently in the expression *οὐκ . . . ἀλλά* cf. § 55, 8 p. 495 sq. or 1 Cor. ix. 9.¹ It was likewise thought that *ἦ* was omitted after the comparative in Jno. xv. 13; 3 Jno. 4 (BCrus.), but the clauses with *ἵνα* in both passages

¹ *Μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ*: Paul takes into view here only the spiritual sense of the law, and considers it from the same point as Philo, who says: *οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλόγων ὁ νόμος ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν νοῦν καὶ λόγον ἔχόντων*, see *Mey*. The πάντων following ought to have deterred from such a weakening of the statement. In Rom. iv. 9, before *ἢ καὶ ἂν εἴπω*, a *μόνον* is not required; and in iii. 28 *μόνον*, in the juxtaposition of *πίστει* and *χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου* (since in Paul's view *πίστει* and *ἔργοις* are mutually exclusive antitheses), would be quite superfluous, and would render the sentence cumbersome. On Rom. iv. 14, see *Fr.* in loc.

are added by way of explanation to the demonstrative pronoun, the Genitive of which is dependent on the comparative. Likewise in instances such as Acts iv. 22 ἐπὶ ἣν πλείωνων τεσσαράκοντα, xxiii. 13, 21; xxiv. 11; xxv. 6; Matt. xxvi. 53 ἥ is not to be supplied (though it is elsewhere used in such a construction). The Greeks had become accustomed to abbreviate the phrase in this manner, and probably did not regard the word πλείονες here as a comparative (more *than*), but as an annexed specification, just as elsewhere the neuter (adv.) πλέον is inserted even without government, see Lob. Phryn. p. 410 sq.; cf. Mtth. S. 1019. Lastly, some wanted (Pott still) in 2 Pet. iii. 4 ἀφ' ἧς οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως to supply ὥς before the last words, which would give an appropriate meaning indeed, but would be entirely arbitrary. Two termini a quo are united here in a single sentence, one 526 closer and one more remote, in so far, that is, as οἱ πατέρες is understood of those very fathers (see in particular Semler) who had received the promise of the παρουσία. (There would be a half ellipsis in a particle, if οὐ stood for οὐπω, cf. especially Withof, opusc. Ling. 1778. 8vo. p. 32 sqq. But in Jno. vi. 17 an οὐπω after the preceding ἤδη is to say the least unnecessary: *it had already become dark, and Jesus had not come*. In Jno. vii. 8 οὐπω is in fact only a correction; if we read οὐκ, we cannot remove the ethical difficulty of the passage by introducing a grammatical one in its place, (see also Boisson. Philostr. her. p. 502; Jacobs, Philostr. imagg. 357, and Aelian. anim. II. 250). It does not follow that οὐ is used for οὐπω in Mark vii. 18 because οὐπω occurs in Matt. xv. 17; but in the latter passage also οὐ is the better supported reading. In Mark xi. 13 *not* is completely sufficient. Against the admission of another sort of half ellipsis, that is, of verba simplicia for composita, see my program de verbor. simpl. pro compositis in N. T. usu et caussis. L. 1833. 4to.)

6. Sometimes a partial ellipsis of both the subject and the predicate occurs in one and the same sentence. Gal. v. 13 μόνον 619 μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί (κατέχητε, τρέψετε, Oecum. 555 ἀποχρήσησθε). The subject as in the second person is obvious 7th ed. from the preceding ἐκλήθητε; and that part of the predicate which forms the copula (κατέχοντες etc., ἦτε, Hm. Vig. 872) is easily gathered from εἰς ἀφορμὴν (cf. Jacobs, Philostr. p. 525). Matt. xxvi. 5 (Mark xiv. 2) μὴ ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ sc. τοῦτο γεγεῖσθω or τοῦτο ποιῶμεν, unless we prefer repeating from vs. 4 the two verbs κρατήσ. κ. ἀποκτείν. These words, and Gal. as above, are no more an aposiopesis (Mey. on Gal. [in the earlier eds.]) than the German: *aber nur nicht am Feste* (not on the feast day). On the partial ellipsis in sentences with μὴ, see Klotz, Devar. II. 669. In 2 Cor. ix. 6 probably with τοῦτο δέ is to be supplied λέγω (Gal. iii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 15) or φημί (1 Cor. vii. 29; xv. 50) Bos

p. 632 sq.; Franke, Demosth. 83; cf. Hm. Aeschyl. II. 362, or even λογίζεσθε, (for Meyer's previous connection of this τοῦτο δέ with ὁ σπείρων following produces a limping construction, as he himself has felt; and his present view, that τοῦτο δέ is an Acc. Abs., is far-fetched). So too in the phrase οὐχ ὅτι (... ἀλλά), designed to prevent a misapprehension, *I say, I mean*, was originally understood before ὅτι (Schaeff. Bos 775; Hm. Vig. 804), Jno. vii. 22 οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐστίν (ἡ περιτομή), ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν πατέρων, vi. 46; 2 Cor. i. 24; iii. 5; Phil. iv. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 9. The phrase, however, became so established by use that its origin was no longer thought of, and so Paul could write in Phil. iv. 11: οὐχ ὅτι καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω. By the side of this οὐχ ὅτι might be placed οὐχ οἷον ὅτι: Rom. ix. 6 οὐχ οἷον δέ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, i.e. οὐ τοῖον δέ λέγω, οἷον ὅτι non tale (dico), quale (hoc est) excidisse etc. And the οἷον ὅτι of the later writers (Schaeff. Gregor. Cor. p. 105) might then be compared, and as respects circumstantiality of expression the phrases adduced by Lob. Phryn. p. 427 ὡς οἷον, οἷον ὥσπερ. Moreover, 527 two explanations of that Pauline phrase have been propounded: 6th ed.

a. It has been rendered: *but it is impossible that*; for the τε usually attached to οἷον in this sense is in the first place not essential, and secondly it is wanting in the passage adduced by Wetst. from Gorgias Leont. σοὶ οὐκ ἦν οἷον μόνον μάρτυρας... εὔρεῖν, cf. also Kayser, Philostr. Soph. p. 348,¹ and in the third place probably also οὐχ οἷον τε δέ might be read (Aelian. 4, 17), and the construction with the Inf. ἐκπεπτωκέναι τὸν λόγον had been resolved by ὅτι, after the fashion of the later language (cf. in Latin *dico quod*)²; de Wette's objection falls to the ground, if we take λόγος θεοῦ as Fr. does. b. Some, with Fr., consider οὐχ οἷον, as it is often used in later writers, a negative adverb: *by no means, no such thing* (properly οὐ τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν ὅτι *the thing* 556 *is not such that*), Polyb. 3, 82, 5; 18, 18, 11. To be sure, the 7th ed. finite verb then always follows without ὅτι; but Paul may either 620 have employed ὅτι pleonastically (like ὡς ὅτι), or have used and construed the phrase in the sense of *multum abest ut, far from being the case that*. Meyer's solution is in no respect more plausible.

¹ Examples of the personal οἷός ἐστι, such as Mey. adduces from Polybius, have no connection with the idiom here examined. Cf. Weber, Demosth. p. 469.

² On the relation of the Infinitive construction to a clause with ὅτι, see Krü. 253.

In Rom. ix. 16 *ἀρα οὖν εἰ τοῦ θελόντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος* etc., where it is enough to supply *ἵνα*, the subject of the impersonal sentence (therefore it is not of him that willeth, does not depend on the will; see, on *εἰναί τινος*, above, p. 195) is to be gathered from the context: viz. *the attainment of Divine mercy*, vs. 15. Similar is Rom. iv. 16 διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως (*ἵνα*), *ἵνα κατὰ χάριν* (ἦ), *therefore from faith* proceeds that of which I speak, namely (primarily gathered from vs. 14) ἡ κληρονομία. As to Rom. v. 18 see above, no. 2 p. 587.

In Matt. v. 38 ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος, the subject and part of the predicate are likewise omitted; although an indication of the latter is contained in ἀντὶ. The words, however, are borrowed from Exod. xxi. 24, where δώσεις precedes. In such well-known expressions as the familiar and almost proverbial passages of the law, even a verb may have been suppressed that could not elsewhere have been omitted without ambiguity; see under 3, b. p. 588.¹

7 Even whole propositions are sometimes omitted by ellipsis (Hm. opusc. p. 159; Vig. 872):

a. Rom. xi. 21 εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφέισατο, μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται sc. δέδοικα or ὀράτε, which, however, is suggested in μήπως. In Matt. xxv. 9 the text. rec. [and Cod. Sin.] has μήποτε οὐκ, but there is a preponderance of authority † for the reading μήποτε οὐ μή, according to which μήποτε would be 528 taken by itself (as dehortatory) *by no means!* sc. δώμεν vs. 8 or 8th ed. γενέσθω τοῦτο, cf. Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9; Exod. x. 11. In Luke xvi. 8 there is not so much an omission of φησί or ἔφη as rather an annexation in oratio recta of the further discourse of him to whom the expression ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν belongs. Similar to this is v. 14. In Greek prose ἔφη, or the like, is suppressed only either where α ὁ δέ, οἱ δέ indicates the speaker (Aelian. 9, 29; anim. 1, 6), or where the mere structure of the sentence indicates that some one (else) speaks, as frequently in dialogues. Van Hengel (annotatt. p. 8 sqq.) is wrong in thinking that this ellipsis 621 (ἔφη ὁ θεός) occurs in Matt. xxiii. 34; see, on the other hand, Fr. Bengel's remark on 1 Cor. ix. 24 is a mistake. In Matt. xvi. 7 διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες· ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν it is far more suitable to supply before ὅτι the simple sentence ταῦτα λέγει

¹ Akin to this Acc. in a passage of the law is that employed in all languages in demands, e.g. καὶ λοφίαν, see Bos p. 601.

[† The contrary statement is made on p. 504. Οὐ μή, although supported by B C D and by the majority of the less important authorities, recommended by Grsb., and adopted by Lchm., Tisch. 2d and 7th, Af., Treg., de Wette, Mey. et al., has been abandoned by Tisch. 8th ed. for οὐκ, which is supported by (besides N) A L Z 33 etc. — J. H. 1.]

and render *ὅτι* by *because*, than to take *ὅτι* for the particle introducing the oratio recta. In Jno. v. 6, 7, the answer *ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω, ἵνα . . . βάλῃ με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν* does not seem to correspond directly to the question *θέλεις ὑγιᾶς γενέσθαι*; so that a simple *yes, certainly*, may be supposed to be omitted. But the sick man does not stop at this simple affirmation, but immediately proceeds to state the obstacle which has hitherto opposed his wish. On passages such as Jno. i. 8 *οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος. τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ*, ix. 3, see p. 316 sq.

b. Sometimes a long protasis is followed by no apodosis, e.g. 2 Thess. ii. 3 f. *ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον . . . ὅτι ἔστιν θεός*, it is necessary to understand from vs. 1: *ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου does not arrive*. The long protasis¹ involves this omission. So, in particular, the apodosis is wanting to a protasis with *ὥσπερ* in Matt. xxv. 14; Rom. v. 12; ix. 22 ff. see § 63, I. 1 p. 569 sq.

Likewise, in quotations from the O. T. there sometimes seems to be an ellipsis of an entire sentence, as in 1 Cor. i. 31 *ἵνα, καθὼς γέγραπται, ὁ καυχόμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω*. After *ἵνα* a *γένηται* or *πληρωθῇ* may be understood. The apostle, however, unconcerned about the grammatical sequence, attached the words of Scripture directly to his own as integral parts of the statement, just as in Rom. xv. 3 he introduces in direct discourse the words of Christ from Ps. lxix., cf. xv. 21. In 1 Cor. ii. 9 f., however, we must not with Mey. [eds. 1st and 2d] take vs. 10 for the apodosis to *ἡ ὀφθαλμός* etc.; but Paul, instead of saying, in continuity with *ἀλλὰ, τοῦτο ἡμῖν* etc., annexes the antithesis directly to the words of the quotation, so that *ἀλλὰ* remains without grammatical sequence.

II. Aposiopesis, or the suppression of a sentence or part of a sentence in consequence of emotion (of anger, cf. Stallb. Plat. Apol. p. 35,² sorrow, fear, etc., cf. Quintil. 9, 2, 54; Tiberius and Alexander de figuris in Walz, rhetor. graec. VIII. 536, 450), in which case the gestures of the speaker supply what is wanting (Hm. p. 153), occurs, not merely in forms of oaths (§ 55, note 622 p. 500) in which it became usual, but also after conditional clauses in the following passages: Luke xix. 42 *εἰ ἔγνων καὶ σύ, καί γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτῃ, τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου, ἴφ θοῦ αὐτοῦ ἠδὲ γνώσῃς ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἔγνωμεν τὴν πόλιν ταύτην*, sc. how fortunate that would have been

¹ To this some refer also Jas. iii. 3 (according to what is undoubtedly the true reading [supported also by Cod. Sin.] *καὶ ὁ λόγος*). But the apodosis is probably contained in the words *καὶ ὁ λόγος τὸ σῶμα*. See the careful discussion by Wiesinger in loc.

² Like the well-known *quos ego* —! or the German: *warte, ich will dich* —! Eng. *mind, or I'll* —! The aposiopesis may occur even in the form of a question, e.g. Num. xiv. 27 *ἕως τίνας τὴν συναγωγὴν τὴν ποιήσαν ταύτην*; cf. Acts xxiii. 9 *Λέων*.

(for thee) ; xxii. 42 *πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ · πλὴν* etc. In both passages sorrow has suppressed the apodosis. Acts xxiii. 9 *οὐδὲν κακὸν εὗρισκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ*
 558 *τούτῳ · εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος . . . we find nothing*
 1th ed. *evil in this man ; but if a spirit has spoken to him or an angel —*
 (which the Pharisees utter with gestures expressive of reserve),
 sc. the matter is significant, or requires caution. Others take the words interrogatively (Lehm.) : *if, however, . . . has spoken?* how then? what is to be done in that case? See, in general, Fr. Conject. I. 30 sq. The addition *μὴ θεομαχῶμεν* found in some Codd. is a gloss. Bornem. has quietly retracted his earlier conjecture. Moreover, it may be doubted whether in the preceding passage an aposiopesis really occurs, or merely a break in the discourse at vs. 10. In Jno. vi. 62 the apodosis, suggested readily by vs. 61, is omitted with an air of triumph : how strange will that appear to you ! In Mark vii. 11 *ὑμεῖς λέγετε · ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί · κορβᾶν . . . ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελθῇς · καὶ οὐκέτι ἀφίετε* etc. the apodosis is to be supplied from vs. 10 : *then he does right in keeping his vow*, and consequently ye release him in this case from the obligation *τιμᾶν τὸν πατέρα* etc., see Krebs in loc.¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff. is an anacoluthon, and not an aposiopesis. Lastly, in Phil. i. 22 the assumption of an aposiopesis (Rillicet) is quite inadmissible. An aposiopesis is in Greek authors² also most frequent after conditional clauses (Plat. sympos. 220 d.). Indeed when two conditional clauses correspond to each other it is quite common to suppress the apodosis after the first (Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 256 ; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 197), the speaker hastening on to the second clause as the more important, as in Plat. Protag. 325 d. *ἐὰν μὲν ἐκὼν πειθῇται · εἰ δὲ μὴ — εὐθύνουσιν ἀπειλαῖς καὶ πληγαῖς,*
 623 *rep. 9, 575 d. οὐκοῦν ἐὰν μὲν ἐκόντες ὑπείκωσιν · ἐὰν δὲ μὴ* etc. Thuc. 3, 3. So Luke. xiii. 9 *κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν · εἰ δὲ μήγε,*
 530 *εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν* *if it bear fruit, well* (let it remain) ;
 6th ed. *but if not, then cut it down* (though here *ἄφες αὐτήν* may be

¹ Many expositors find an aposiopesis (?) also in the parallel passage Matt. xv. 5 *ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί · δῶρον δ' ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελθῇς · καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμῇσιν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ* — that is, *he acts properly* (in conformity to the law). But perhaps [yet see Meyer's objections] we should, with *Grotius* and *Bengel*, regard the apodosis as commencing with *καὶ οὐ μή* : whoever says to his parents . . . he is not obliged also (in such case) to honor his parents, he is thereby also (in that case) released from the commandment *τίμα τὸν πατέρα*. The *καὶ* then would not be pleonastic.

² From the O. T. cf. Exod. xxxii. 32 ; Dan. iii. 15 ; Zech. vi. 15 ; see *Köster*, *Erläuter. der heil. Schrift*, §. 97.

supplied from what precedes). (On the omission after *εἰ δὲ μή* or *εἰ δὲ μή γε* of the entire conditional clause, to be supplied from the context preceding, see above, p. 583.)

As an aposiopesis *ὅρα μή* might also be regarded in Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9, with which may be compared the forms of dehortation or deprecation, frequent in the tragedians, *μή ταῦτα* Eurip. Io 1335, *μή σύ γε* etc. Yet see above, p. 583 sq.

In Rom. vii. 25 to the complaint *τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου*; is annexed, in an overpowering burst of joy, a brief *thanks be to God!* — also a species of aposiopesis. In unimpassioned style, Paul would have said: thanks be to God that he has already liberated me, etc.

Also in 2 Cor. vii. 12 *ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν* some have assumed a reservation, where Billroth still wants to supply *χαλεπὸν τι*. Paul would thus have purposely omitted the word, because the affair still gave him pain. But *ἔγραψα* is of itself complete.

§ 65. REDUNDANT STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; PLEONASM (SUPERFLUITY),¹ DIFFUSENESS.

1. A Pleonasm² is the opposite of an ellipsis, as redundancy is the opposite of deficiency. A pleonasm, accordingly, would be exemplified in the addition of a word that is not intended to add anything to the meaning of the sentence (Hm. opusc. I. 217, 222). 624 In point of fact the earlier philologists not only believed in the existence of superfluous words, especially particles (Hm. opusc. p. 226), but Kühnöl on Matt. v. 1 (cf. Weiske, pleon. p. 34) goes so far as to maintain that *τὸ ὅρος* may be used for *ὅρος*. But as this (pleonasm of the definite article) is a downright absurdity, so is the existence of expletives in the Greek literary language a figment. In general, pleonasm, which takes place chiefly in pred-

¹ See Fischer, Weller. III. I. 269 sqq.; B. Weiske, Pleonasmus graeci s. commentar. de vocib., quae in sermone Graeco abundare dicuntur. Lips. 1807. 8vo.; Poppo, Thucyd. I. I. 197 sqq.; in reference to the N. T. Glass. Phil. sacra I 641 sqq. (it relates, however, more to the O. T., and is on the whole meagre); Bauer, Philol. Thucyd. Paull. p. 202 sqq.; Tzschucke, de sermon. J. Chr. p. 270 sqq.; Haab S. 324 ff.; J. H. Maii diss. de pleonasmis ling. graec. in N. T. Giess. 1728. (10 sheets). This writer had intended to write a work on Pleonasmus in general; see his observatt. in libr. sacr. I. 52. Another work, by M. Nascou, announced in a Prodromus (Havn. 1787. 8vo.), failed, in like manner, to make its appearance.

² Glassius, as above, has sensible remarks on the definition of a pleonasm; cf. also Flacii clavis script. sacr. II. 4, 224, and my 1st Progr. de verbis compos. p. 7 sq. Quintil. instit. 8, 3, 53 gives a simple, but, rightly understood, adequate definition: pleonasmus vitium, cum supervacuis verbis oratio oneratur.

icates (Hm. as above, p. 219), consists in ingrafting into a sentence
 581 words the full import of which has been already conveyed in
 6th ed. another part of the same sentence (or period), either by the same
 or by an equivalent expression. Even this, however, is done
 intelligently only when,

a From carelessness, or from want of confidence in the reader's
 attention, the same thing is (particularly in extended sentences)
 repeated: *nonne tibi ad me venienti nonne dixi?* Here *nonne* is
 intended in reality to be thought but once. So Col. ii. 13 *καὶ*
 560 *ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι . . . συνεζωποποίησεν ὑμᾶς*
 7th ed. *σύν αὐτῷ*, Matt. viii. 1; Eph. ii. 11 f.; Phil. iv. 15 var. [Matt. iv. 16]
 (Vechnier, Hellenol. p. 177 sq.), Mark vii. 25 *γυνή, ἥς εἶχεν τὸ θυγά-*
τριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, Rev. vii. 2, see § 22, 4 p. 147 sq.
 (Demosth. Euerg. 688 b. *οὔτοι φόντο ἐμέ, εἰ πολλά μου λάβοιεν*
ἐνέχυρα, ἄσμενον ἀφήσειν με τοὺς μάρτυρας), 1 Cor. vii. 26 *νομίζω*
τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν . . . ὅτι καλὸν ἀνθρώπων, Rev. xii. 9 (?) cf.
 V. Fritzsche, quæst. Lucian. 14 sq.; 2 Tim. iv. 9 *σπούδαςον*
ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με ταχέως, 2 Cor. viii. 24 *τὴν ἐνδειξιν τ. ἀγάπης . . .*
ἐνδεικνύμενοι (yet see § 32, 2 p. 224) cf. Plato, legg. 12, 966 b.
τὴν ἐνδειξιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀδυνατεῖν ἐνδείκνυσθαι (Xen. Cyr. 8,
 2, 5). To this head may be referred also Rom. ix. 29 Sept. *ὡς*
ἐμόρῳρα ἂν ὠμοιώθημεν (in the parallel member *ὡς . . . ἂν*
ἐγενήθημεν), as well as *λογίζεσθαι* or *ἡγεῖσθαι* *τινα ὡς* 2 Cor. x. 2;
 2 Thess. iii. 15; Lucian. Peregr. 11 (instead of the Acc. alone,
 cf. *πρὸς* Job xix. 11), as even in Greek authors we find *νομίζειν*
ὡς (yet see Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 180) and the like. Different
 are Luke xx. 2 *εἰπον πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγοντες*, Mark xii. 26 *πῶς*
εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων, Acts xxviii. 25 *τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν . . .*
λέγον etc. In all these passages the Participle serves to introduce
 (as frequently in the Sept.) the direct discourse (cf. the well-known
ἔφη λέγων Döderlein, Synon. IV. 13), which might assuredly be
 annexed immediately to *εἰπον*, *εἶπε*. Different from this, again,
 are Matt. xxii. 1; Luke xii. 16, and still more Luke xiv. 7; xvi. 2;
 xviii. 2, etc.

Another mode of introducing the direct discourse, Luke xxii. 61
 625 *ὑπεμνήσθη τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ*, Acts xi. 16 *ἐμνήσθη τοῦ*
ρήματος τοῦ κυρίου, ὡς ἔλεγεν, is to be referred to circumstantiality (see
 below, no. 4 p. 606 sq.), like the usage of even Attic authors, Xen. Cyr. 8,
 2, 14 *λόγος αὐτοῦ ἀπομνημονεύται, ὡς λέγοι*, see Bornem. schol. p. 141, and
 is not to be deemed a pleonasm.

2. Or when b. one of the synonymous expressions has, from

usage, partially lost its meaning,¹ as in ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν (Iliad. 8, 365), ἔξοχος ἄλλων (Hm. Homer. hymn. in Cerer. 362), or a repetition, originally emphatic, has in course of time become weakened, as πάλιν αὐθις (Hm. Vig. 886). So in the N. T. ἀπὸ μακρόθεν Matt. xxvi. 58; Mark xv. 40; Rev. xviii. 10 (Wetst. I. 524 sq.), ἀπὸ ἁνωθεν Matt. xxvii. 51; Mark xv. 38, ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο Jno. xi. 7 (εὐθέως παραχρῆμα Acts xiv. 10 Cod. D) cf. ἔπειτα μετὰ ταῦτα Dem. Neaer. 530 etc., εἰτα μετὰ τοῦτο or ταῦτα Arist. ^{6th ed.} rhet. 2, 9, 13; Plat. Lach. 190 e. For similar instances, see Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 343; III. II. 38;² in Latin *deinde postea* Cic. Mil. 561 24, 65, *post deinde, tum deinde* etc. Vechner, Hellenol. p. 156 sqq. ^{7th ed.} Also Luke xix. 4 προδραμὸν ἔμπροσθεν (Xen. C. 2, 2, 7; 7, 1, 36), iv. 29 ἐκβάλλειν ἔξω, Luke xxiv. 50 ἐξάγειν ἔξω, Rev. iii. 12 (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 337; Bornem. schol. 166 sq.), Acts xviii. 21 πάλιν ἀνακάμπτεω (Ceb. 29, cf. Kritz, Sallust. I, 88), Mark vii. 36 μᾶλλον περισσώτερον (§ 35, 1 p. 240, cf. Hm. opusc. 222; Vechner, Hellenol. p. 166 sqq.), Luke xxii. 11 ἐρεῖτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας³ (Bornem. in loc.), Rev. xviii. 22, cf. Odys. 14, 101 σὺν συνόσια, Her. 5, 64 στρατηγὸν τῆς στρατῆς, Plato, legg. 2, 671 d.; Cedren. I. 343; Theocr. 25, 95; Jno. xii. 13 τὰ βατὰ τῶν φοινίκων (βατὰ of itself signifies palm branches), Acts ii. 30 ὄρκῳ ὥμοσεν ὁ θεός, cf. Exod. xxv. 12. See Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 10; Bornem. Xen. conv. 186; Pflugk, Eurip. Hec. p. 18; Lob. paralip. 534 sqq.

To this head are to be referred the established *schemata*:

a. that καί is used after particles of comparison, Acts xi. 17 626 εἰ τὴν ἴσιν δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν, 1 Cor. vii. 7 θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτὸν (see above, p. 440); for the *also* is already implied in the comparison, which makes this very declaration that something takes place *also* in the case of a second object.

¹ From the department of Etymology may be adduced, as instances of the same nature, the double comparatives μαιζότερος etc., see § 11, 2 p. 69. In German, cf. *mehrere*, for which pedantic purists would substitute, both in writing and speaking, *mehre*.

² Cf. from later writers ἀπὸ πανταχόθεν Const. Manass. p. 127, ἀπὸ πρῶθεν or μηκόθεν Theophan. cont. 519, 524, ἐκ δυσμύθεν Nicet. Annal. 18, p. 359 d., ἐκ παιδόθεν or νηπίοθεν Malal. 18, p. 429; 5, p. 117, ἔνεκα περὶ Cedren. 1, p. 716, περὶ . . . ἔνεκα Niceph. Cpolit. p. 6, 35, ἀνθ' ὧν ἔνεκα Theophan. cont. p. 138, ἀνθ' ὧν δεῖ Deut. xxviii. 62. On the last examples, see Hm. opusc. 220.

³ Οἰκοδομεῖν οἶκον Luke vi. 48 is no more a pleonasm than *aedificare domum*, as both verbs acquired at a very early period, from usage, the signification of *to build* (generally). See other instances of the sort in Lobeck, paralip. p. 501 sq.

β. that an additional negative is annexed to a verb of negation in a clause dependent on that verb and supplementing it, 1 Jno. ii. 22 ὁ ἀρνούμενος, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός, Luke xx. 27 ἀντιλέγοντες, μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν (Xen. C. 2, 2, 20; An. 2, 5, 29; Isocr. Trapez. 360; Dem. Phorm. 585; Thuc. 1, 77), Heb. xii. 19 οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρητήσαντο μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον (Thuc. 5, 63), Gal. v. 7 τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι (Eurip. Hec. 860). Cf. further Luke iv. 42; Acts xx. 27; 1 Pet. iii. 10 (Thuc. 5, 25; 7, 53; Plat. Phaed. 117 c.; Demosth. Phaenipp. 654 b.; see Vig. pp. 459, 811; Alberti, observ. p. 470 sq.; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 10; Bttm. exc. 2 in Mid. p. 142 sqq.; Mtth. 1242 f.).

The German employs a similar construction in the conversational style; and this usage in Greek may be accounted for by the circumstantiality peculiar to familiar discourse, since in these verbs the force of the negation gradually became less sensible, and thus was expressly renewed in the dependent clause, cf. Mdv. S. 248. Recent writers, indeed, maintain that this mode of expression is 562 not to be considered as pleonastic (Hm. opusc. p. 232; Klotz, 7th ed. Devar. p. 668¹); yet logically one of the negatives is undeniably 533 superfluous. (But even in the N. T. the negation is not always 6th ed. subjoined, e.g. after verbs of hindering Luke xxiii. 2; Acts viii. 36 [1 Thess. ii. 16]; Rom. xv. 22; cf. Mtth. 1243; Mdv. 248; Klotz, Devar. p. 668.)

On the other hand, the following constructions are different from the preceding: Acts x. 15 πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου (cf. Jno. iv. 54), Jno. xxi. 16 πάλιν δεύτερον (Plut. Phil. c. 15), Gal. iv. 9 πάλιν ἄνωθεν (Isocr. Areopag. p. 338 πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς), *rursus denuo* (Hand, Tursell. II. 279); in all which passages a more definite word is added as explanatory. Still greater difference is there in Acts v. 23 according to the reading τοὺς φύλακας ἐξω ἐστῶτας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν (Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 23); also in Luke ii. 36 αὕτη ἦν προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς (cf. i. 7, 18), for the meaning is: she was *far* advanced (Lucian. Peregr. 27 ποῦρρωτάτω γήρως προβεβηκώς); Rev. ix. 7 τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν ἀκρίδων ὁμοία ἵπποις, for ὁμοιώματα signifies 627 forms, cf. Ezek. x. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 17 εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ si placuerit voluntati divinae, since θέλημα means the will itself and θέλειν the operation of the will (like the *stream streams* etc.) cf. Jas. iii. 4. In Jno. xx. 4, however, προέδραμεν τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου is to be taken thus: he ran on before, faster than Peter (closer specification). In 2 Pet. iii. 6 ὕδατι would not be superfluous even if ὑδάτων were supplied with δι' ὧν;

¹ Non otiosam esse negationem in ejusmodi locis, sed ita poni infinitivum, ut non res, quae prohibenda videatur, intelligatur, sed qua vi ac potestate istius prohibitionis jam non fiat.

it would designate water as an element, whereas ὕδατα (cf. Gen. vii. 11) would signify the concrete (separate) bodies of water. Cf. further, Jude 4. As to Heb. vi. 6 see my 3d Progr. de verbh. compos. p. 10. That Luke xx. 43 ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου (Heb. i. 13) *footstool of thy feet*, Gen. xvii. 13 ὁ οἰκογενῆς τῆς οἰκίας σου (Deut. vii. 13) are not, on account of the Gen. annexed, entirely similar to the preceding examples, is obvious. Lastly, such passages as Mark viii. 4 ὦδε . . . ἐπ' ἐρημίας, xiii. 29 ἐγγὺς . . . ἐπὶ θύραις, 2 Tim. ii. 10 do not properly fall under the notion of pleonasm (Heinichen, Euseb. II. 186), but of apposition. Likewise Mark xii. 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, ὅταν ἀναστῶσι can hardly be called diffuseness, as the last clause here is an application of the general ἐν τῇ ἀναστ. to the brothers mentioned in vs. 20 ff. See Lob. paralip. p. 534. As a *half* pleonasm might ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας Eph. v. 2 (both derivatives of ὄζω) be regarded, and compared perhaps to παίδων ἀπαῖς (Eurip. Androm. 613; Hm. opusc. p. 221). But it signifies *an odor of sweet smell*; ὁσμὴ is the smell as inhaled, εὐωδία is its quality.

3. c. Lastly, many redundancies are attributable to a blending of two constructions, Hm. opusc. p. 224; Vig. p. 887; as, Luke ii. 21 ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτώ . . . καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα (instead of ἐπλήσθ. δὲ ἡμ. . . . καί, or ὅτε ἐπλ. . . . ἐκλήθη), vii. 12 ὡς ἤγγισε 563 τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκώς, Acts x. 17. To this head might be referred also Rom. ix. 29 (see under a.); and it is even possible that ὅτι before the oratio recta originated in this way (Rost, Gr. 641). With more assurance may we explain thus the pleonastic negation in the phrase ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ (Devar. 1, 74): 1 Cor. xiv. 5 μείζων ὁ προφητεύων ἢ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσας, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύη *except he interpret*, xv. 2; 1 Tim. v 19. The 534 Germans in colloquial speech often employ a similar mode of expression: *alle waren zugegen, ausgenommen du nicht; ich komme nicht, bevor du nicht gesagt hast* etc. In the preceding quotation, either ἐκτὸς εἰ διερμηνεύη or εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύη might have been used. On that and other similar phrases (such as πλὴν εἰ μὴ) much has been collected by Lob. Phryn. p. 459; cf. also Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 869; Doederlein, Oed. Col. p. 382 sqq. On the other hand, in the expression εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, when it seems to mean, *but if not, otherwise* (after a negative clause) Matt. vi. 1; ix. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 16, the negation cannot be considered as pleonastic according to the original import of the phrase; see Fr. 628 Mt. p. 255.

4. The greater part of what has been called pleonasm in the N. T. (and out of it) is *circumstantiality* or more frequently *fulness* of expression (Hm. opusc. p. 222 sqq. and Vig. 887;

Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 204 sqq.); the former of which arises from the writer's endeavor to be rightly understood, and the latter is designed to give vividness, force (solemnity), sonorousness to style. It must also be remembered that the N. T. diction is to a great extent conversational, or akin to it; and that the above-mentioned peculiarities are pre-eminently characteristic of Oriental expression. Such phraseology differs from pleonasm in this, that every word and part of a word in a sentence contains something intended to add to the general meaning, though it may not be absolutely necessary for the logical completeness of the thought, e.g. Mark i. 17 ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων, for which Matt. iv. 19 has ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων. The opposite is not ellipsis, but conciseness.

In the first place, as respects *circumstantiality* the following cases are to be distinguished:

- a. A word, only required once to complete the thought, is repeated in every parallel member where it might have been simply understood: ¹ Heb. ii. 16 οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβρ. ἐπιλαμβάνεται, Jno. xii. 3 ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξέμαξε ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, Rev. xiv. 2 ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . καὶ ἡ φωνή, ἦν ἤκουσα, ix. 21; xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 12; xv. 54; Phil. ii. 16; 564 iv. 17; Jno. x. 10; Rev. ix. 1 f.; Mark i. 40; Matt. xviii. 32, cf. 7th ed. in Greek authors, Xen. Mem. 2, 10, 3; Demosth. Zenoth. 576 c.; Long. 2, 3; Lucian. Cynic. 9; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. 117; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 23; in Latin the expressions, especially frequent in Jul. Caesar, *in ea loca, quibus in locis; dies, quo die* etc. Such repetitions ensure perspicuity, particularly when several words intervene. Sometimes repetitions have a rhetorical aspect, see no. 5.
- b. The usual or indispensable instrument (e.g. a human limb) is expressly mentioned along with the action in point: Acts 535 xv. 23 γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν (they were to deliver it), xi. 30 6th ed. (2 Cor. xi. 33); xix. 11; iii. 18 προκυτήγγειλε διὰ στόματος πάντων 629 τῶν προφητῶν, xv. 7; Luke i. 70 etc. Cf. from the poets, Eurip. Ion 1187 χερσὶν ἐκχέων σπονδάς (var.), Hec. 526 f.; Theocr. 7, 153 ποσὶ χορεῦσαι, see Lob. Aj. p. 222 f. (Wunder, Recens. p. 17 sq.). But in Rom. x. 15 (Sept.) ὡς ὡραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων

¹ We must judge differently many of the repetitions used by the orators who had in view the delivery before the people of what they had written; cf. Foertsch, de locis Lysiae, p. 29. Of a different nature also is the repetition of the same word in Plat. Charm. 168 a.

εἰρήνην the notion of *arrival*, implied in *πόδες*, is very far from being superfluous; and in 1 Jno. i. 1 δ *ἐώρακαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν* (Luke ii. 30) an emphasis is obviously intended in the last words, like: *to see with one's own eyes* (Hesiod. theog. 701; Thuc. 2, 11; Aristot. mirab. 160; Heliod. 4, 19; see Bremi, Aesch. I. 124; cf. Jani ars poet. p. 220 sq.). And in Mark vi. 2; Acts v. 12 it is to be considered that the miracles in question were wrought by the laying on of hands. But analogous to this (circumstantial) form of expression is Luke i. 76 *προπορεύση πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου*, ix. 52 (ܡܬܝܬܝܐ), a phrase used also as precisely equivalent to *before* (in reference to inanimate objects): Acts xiii. 24 *πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ*, cf. Sept. Num. xix. 4 *ἀπέναντι τοῦ προσώπου τῆς σκηνῆς*, Ps. xxxiv. 6 *κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀνέμου*.

c. An action which according to the nature of the case precedes another, is also expressed separately, and generally by a participle: Matt. xxvi. 51 *ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ*, ii. 8 *ὅπως κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ* (xiv. 33), Jno. vi. 5 *ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ θεασάμενος* etc., Matt. xiii. 31 *ὁμοία κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν* etc. vs. 33; Acts xvi. 3 (Xen. Eph. 3, 4 *ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν λαβὼν ἄγει πρὸς τὸν Ἀνθίαν*, see Locella p. 141), Jno. vi. 15 *γινὼς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ἀρπάξω αὐτόν*, Matt. xix. 21. Likewise in 1 Cor. ii. 1 *κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἦλθον οὐ* etc. the participle was not necessary. What Bornem. Cyrop. 5, 8, 2 has adduced is of a different nature, as in his passages the participle is separated by several words from its verb. On the other hand, in Luke i. 31 *συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν* etc. no one will find a mere redundancy of language; the momentous nature of the favor vouchsafed her is expressed by specifying its several particulars. In Luke xxiv. 50 *ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς* the participle denotes the symbolical gesture of the person blessing. In Eph. ii. 17 *ἐλθὼν* marks a particular both important and demanding distinct consideration; so too in Luke xii. 37. Likewise in Jno. xxi. 13 *ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ διδωσιν αὐτοῖς* every separate act of the wonderful occurrence is designedly specified, and, as it were, placed before the eyes. In Jno. xi. 48 *ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι* refers to the approach of the Roman armies. See, further, Matt. viii. 3, 7; ix. 18; xxvii. 48; Luke vi. 20 (Ael. 12, 22); Jno. xv. 16; Rev. xvi. 1, 2. And in Acts viii. 35 *ἀνοίξας ὁ Φίλιππος τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀρχάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης εὐηγγελίσαστο* etc. prob-

ably ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα etc. serves for the (solemn) introduction of an important discourse ; as undoubtedly is the case in Matt. v. 2 (see Fr. in loc.). Cf. in general, Fischer, de vitiis lexic. p. 223 sqq.; Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 134.

d. A word which we are accustomed to think is implied in 536 another is also explicitly stated : Acts iii. 3 ἡρώτα ἐλεημοσύνην
6th ed. λαβεῖν (see Wetst. in loc. and Boisson. Eunap. p. 459 ; cf. Vir. Aen. 5, 262 loricae . . . donat habere viro), Mark i. 17 ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλείς ἀνθρώπων, see above, p. 606 ; cf. Exod. xxiii. 15 ; Demosth. ep. 3, p. 114 b. ἡ καὶ τοὺς ἀναισθήτους ἀνεκτοὺς ποιεῖν δοκεῖ γίνεσθαι.

e. In the course of a narration the Hebraistic καὶ ἐγένετο is prefixed to particular occurrences : Matt. vii. 28 καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε συνετέλεσεν . . . ἐξεπλήρουντο, for which a Greek author would say simply, καὶ ὅτε or ὅτε δὲ συνετ. etc.¹ On the other hand, in Jno. xi. 11 ταῦτα εἶπεν, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει αὐτοῖς, neither ταῦτα εἶπεν nor μετὰ τοῦτο is superfluous ; the latter indicates a pause.

To c. might be referred also the use of the participle ἀναστὰς, as in Matt. ix. 9 ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, Mark ii. 14 ; vii. 24 ; Luke i. 39 (similar to the Hebrew עָמַל). But although here ἀναστὰς was not necessary, yet this participle is by no means redundant in other passages which expositors bring under the same rule. Thus in Matt. xxvi. 62 ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ means obviously : *he stood up* from indignation, he rose (from his seat) ; similar is Acts v. 17 ; Mark i. 35 πρὸς ἄννησον λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθε rising in the morning, while it was still very dark, etc. ; Luke xv. 18 ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου (I will arise and go) *I will forthwith*, etc. In general, too many participles in the N. T. have been represented as redundant ; and though the decision 681 may occasionally be doubtful, yet very many of them express notions which were they not expressed would be missed. Thus in 1 Cor. vi. 15 ἄρας ὅν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιήσω πόρνης μέλη ; (see Bengel in loc. 566 Aristoph. eq. 1130 ; Soph. O. R. 1270), 1 Pet. iii. 19 τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι
7th ed. πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν. In Luke xii. 37 παρελθὼν διακονήσει αὐτοῖς drawing near, *he will serve them*, even tested by our Western notions, is more striking and vivid than if παρελθὼν had been omitted, (παρελθὼν in Ael. 2, 30 likewise, does not seem to me redundant). Cf. in general, Schaefer.

¹ This always occurs when an additional specification of time precedes the principal clause, and the principal verb is then appended either by καὶ (see on this Fr. Mt. p. 341), as in Matt. ix. 10 ; Luke v. 1, 12 ; ix. 51, or more frequently without a copula, as in Matt. xi. 1 ; xiii. 53 ; xix. 1 ; xxvi. 1 ; Mark iv. 4 ; Luke i. 8, 41 ; ii. 1 etc. This usage is most frequent in Luke's Gospel. To render this καὶ by *also, even*, is far from a happy thought, Born. Schol. p. 25. Besides, this ἐγένετο is pleonastic, as the specification of time might be directly joined to the principal verb.

Soph. I. 253, 278; II. 314; Demosth. IV. 623; Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 134; Mitth. 1300 f.

Further, with Acts iii. 3 under d. may be compared Acts xi. 22 *ἐξαπέστειλεν Βαρνάβαν διελθεῖν ὥς Ἀντιοχείας* (where the ancient versions drop the Inf. as superfluous, though it undoubtedly existed in the text), which, however, properly signifies: *they sent him out with the commission to go etc.* Similar is Acts xx. 1 *ἐξῆλθεν πορευθῆναι εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν* *he departed to go to Macedonia.* Cf. also Caes. civ. 3, 33. On the other hand, 537 I cannot with Born. find a mere redundancy in οἱ δὲ καταξιοθέντες τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ τυχεῖν Luke xx. 35. The τυχεῖν denotes something not strictly implied in καταξιόσθαι preceding, and is required to render the expression complete and perspicuous. Cf. Demosth. cor. p. 328 b. κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀξιόσ' εἰμι ἐπαίνου τυχεῖν, and Bos, exercit. p. 48; Bornem. schol. p. 125.

Such idioms as Mark xi. 5 τί ποιεῖτε λύοντες τὸν πῶλον, Acts xxi. 13 τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθρύπτοντές μου τὴν καρδίαν, in comparison with the usual τί λύετε, κλαίετε, appear to be, in like manner, circumstantial. But *what do ye loosing* properly denotes: *what is your intention in loosing, quid hoc sibi vult? ποιεῖν*, therefore, has not here the general meaning of *do*, which is already contained in every special verb; and the phrase τί λύετε (for) *what loose ye?* may with more probability be regarded as abbreviated, than the preceding phrase as redundant.

5. *Fulness of expression*, by which the writer aims sometimes at didactic or rhetorical force (solemnity), sometimes at graphic vividness, occurs generally in one of the following forms:

a. The same word is once and again repeated in parallel members (Xen. An. 3, 4, 45): Eph. ii. 17 *εὐηγγελισατο εἰρήνην ὑμῶν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς*, Jno. vi. 63 *τὰ ῥήματα . . . πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωὴ ἐστιν*, Col. i. 28 *νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον*, Jno. i. 10; ix. 5; xiv. 26, 27; xv. 19; xix. 10; Matt. xii. 37; Rom. v. 12; xiv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 24, 27; xiii. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 26; Rom. (iii. 31) viii. 15 *οὐκ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας . . . ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας* (in Heb. xii. 18, 22 the repetition was essential to perspicuity); 632 1 Cor. x. 1 f. *οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλῃν ἦσαν καὶ πάντες δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον, καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο καὶ πάντες . . . καὶ πάντες etc.* (Caes. bell. gall. 1, 31), Phil. iii. 2; iv. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 24; Rev. viii. 7, 12; 1 Cor. vi. 11 *ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε*, i. 20; iv. 8; 1 Tim. v. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 2 *ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἰδοὺ νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας* (Arrian. Epict. 567 3, 23, 20), xi. 20; Eph. vi. 12, 17; v. 10; 1 Jno. i. 1; Rev. xiv. 8; 77

xviii. 2 (likewise the polysyndeton in Rev. vii. 12; Rom. ii. 17 f.; 1 Cor. xiii. 2 may be referred to this head). So often in earnest addresses; as, Matt. xxv. 11 *κύριε, κύριε, ἀνοιξον ἡμῖν*, xxiii. 37; Luke viii. 24; x. 41; xxii. 31; Acts ix. 4, and demands Jno. xix. 6; Krüg. Dion. p. 11. In all these cases it was not to be left to the reader to repeat in thought a word employed once, but as often as it is to be understood the writer expresses it, in order to render its importance perceptible (especially *ἐκ παραλλήλου* Rom. xi. 32; 1 Cor. xv. 21).

b. Especially often (particularly by John) is a thought, intended to be brought out with great precision, expressed affirmatively in one member of a sentence and negatively in another (parallelismus antitheticus, see Hm. opusc. p. 223): Jno. i. 20 *ὠμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἡρνήσατο*, Eph. v. 15 *μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί*, vs. 17; Jno. i. 3; iii. 16; x. 5 (xviii. 20); xx. 27; 1 Jno. i. 6; ii. 4, 27; Luke i. 20; Acts xviii. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 7; Jas. i. 5, 23; 1 Pet. i. 23; v. 2; 538 Heb. vii. 21; x. 37 (Sept.); xii. 8; Rev. ii. 13; iii. 9 (Deut. 638 d. xxviii. 13; Isa. iii. 9; xxxviii. 1; Ezek. xviii. 21; Hos. v. 3); cf. Eurip. El. 1057 *φημὶ κοῦκ ἀπαρνούμαι*, Ael. an. 2, 43 *οὐκ ἀρνοῦνται οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀλλ' ὁμολογοῦσι*, especially in the orators, Dem. fals. leg. p. 200 c. *φράσω καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρύψομαι*, see Maii observ. sacr. II. 77 sqq.; Kypke I. 350 sq.; Poppo, Thucyd. I. I. 204; Hm. Med. ed. Elmsley p. 361 and Soph. Oed. Col. p. 41; Philoct. p. 44; Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 19; Weber, Demosth. p. 314; Boisson. Eunap. p. 164 sqq.; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 157.

c. In the following combinations graphic effect is aimed at: Acts xxvii. 20 *περιηρείτο ἐλπίς πᾶσα*, Rom. viii. 22 *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συσπενδύει καὶ συνωδίνει*, Matt. ix. 35; cf. Diod. S. IV. 41 *περινιψάμενος τὸ σῶμα πᾶν*, Strabo 11, 500 *πολλαῖς συμπληρούμενος πηγαῖς*, Lucian. paras. 12; Long. 4, 15; Cic. sen. 18 *consurrexisse omnes*, Liv. 33, 29 *cum omnia terrore et fuga com- plessent*, see my 2d Progr. de verb. compos. p. 21 sq.

d. Likewise the forms of address in Acts i. 11 *ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι*, 638 iii. 12 *ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται*, ii. 14; v. 35; xiii. 16 have the same (courteous) force (men of Israel!) as the well-known *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*, which itself occurs in Acts xvii. 22, or *ἄνδρες δικασταί*. See § 59, 1 p. 523.

Every single word was indispensable in 2 Cor. ii. 16 *ὃς μὲν ὁσμὴ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, ὃς δὲ ὁσμὴ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν*. *A savor of death unto death, a savor of life unto life*, means: an odor of death which, from its nature, can bring nothing else than death, etc.

Redundancy of expression is often erroneously supposed to exist in passages where *synonymes* are found connected in order to express (as frequently in Demosth.) a *single* main idea, see Schaefer. Demosth. I. 209, 320, 756; Plutarch. IV. 387; V. 106; Weber, Demosth. p. 376; Franke, Demosth. p. 12; Bremi, Aeschin. I. 79; Lucian. Alex. ed. Jacob p. 24; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 619; Schoem. Plut. Agis 171; cf. Lob. paralip. 61 sq. But Paul, from whom the examples in question have mostly been taken, 568 is not in the habit of combining in one sentence really synonymous expressions, — (not even in Eph. i. 5, 19; ii. 1; iv. 23; 1 Cor. i. 10; ii. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1; v. 5; cf. Jas. iii. 13; Jno. xii. 49; 1 Pet. i. 4; iv. 9; 1 Jno. i. 1, etc.; Fr. Rom. II. 372). A more careful study of Greek, but especially of apostolic diction, precludes a supposition according to which e.g. the apostolic salutation χάρις, ελεος καὶ εἰρήνη, would become extremely flat.¹ Likewise there is nothing pleonastic in the combinations θυμὸς ὀργῆς Rev. xvi. 19, πέλαγος τῆς θαλάσσης Matt. xviii. 6, ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας 2 Thess. ii. 8, σπλάγχνα ἐλέους or οἰκτιρμοῦ Luke i. 78; Col. iii. 12. The second of these was correctly rendered *aequor maris* by so early a critic as Wetstein; πέλαγος, that is, denotes the expanse (of the sea), and is thus applied to the surface of a river also, see Schwarz, commentar. p. 1067.² And σπλάγχνα is a comprehensive expression which is more closely defined by the Genitive. The parallelismus membrorum, which occasionally 539 occurs in the N. T. (see § 68, 3), has nothing to do with pleonasm. As 611 ed. to the parallel distribution of doctrinal particulars in Rom. iv. 25; x. 10, see de Wette on the first passage.

6. The pleonasm of entire sentences is inconceivable. When a sentence is expressed a second time with but slight alteration, the writer's object always is to give to a thought peculiar force, or to exhibit it under different points of view. This occurs in 2 Cor. xii. 7 τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι, ἐδόθη 634 μοι σκόλοψ . . . ἵνα με κολαφίσῃ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι (where the last words are omitted, it is true, in good Codd. [also Sin.], but surely only because they seemed superfluous), Rev. ii. 5 μετανοήσου καὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἔργα ποιήσου· εἰ δὲ μὴ (μετανοεῖς), ἔρχομαί σοι ταχὺ καὶ κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσῃς (cf. Plat. Gorg. 514 a. ἡμῖν ἐπιχειρητέον ἐστὶ . . . θεραπεύειν, ὥς βελτίστους αὐτοὺς τοὺς πολίτας ποιούντας·

¹ Schaefer's remark, Demosth. I. 320, "usus (synonymorum) duplex, gravior alter, ut vim conciliant orationi, alter levior, ut vel aures expleant vel numeros reddant iucundiores," has reference primarily only to the orators.

² The investigation of N. T. synonyms (begun not infelicitously by Bengel) has lately been prosecuted, rather on the principle of free combination than historically, by Tittmann (de synonymis N. T. lib. I. Lipsiae 1829. 8vo.). Further, cf. also the collections and remarks in Bornemann's diss. de glossem. N. T. p. 29 sqq.

ἀνευ γὰρ δὴ τούτου, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν εὐρίσκομεν, οὐδὲν ὄφελος . . . ἐὰν μὴ καλὴ ἀγαθὴ ἢ διάνοια ἢ τῶν μελλόντων etc. Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 23). On 1 Cor. xiv. 6 see Mey. On 1 Cor. vii. 26, see above, no. 1 p. 602. On the other hand, in 1 Jno. ii. 27 ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ χρίσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς . . . καί, καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς, μενεῖτε ἐν αὐτῷ the resumptive phrase καθὼς etc. is so far from being a pleonasm, that it could hardly have been dispensed with. Similar is Rev. x. 3, 4. Cf. as to such expressions Hm. 569 Eurip. Bacch. 1060 and Soph. Antig. 691; Philoct. 269, 454; 7th ed. Reisig, conject. Aristoph. p. 314 sq.; Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 52 and Cic. nat. d. 1, 16; Schaef. Demosth. V. 726; Mtth. 1541 f. Of a different nature is Rev. ii. 13 οἶδα ποῦ κατοικεῖς· ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ σατανᾶ, where ὅπου ὁ θρόνος etc. is immediately annexed to explain (as if in answer to) ποῦ κατοικεῖς. So might also Mark ii. 24 be taken; but τί here is probably *why*? On the other hand, 2 Cor. vii. 8; Jno. xiii. 17 do not come under this head; and in 1 Cor. i. 22 the clause ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι . . . μαρτάν is manifestly not a mere repetition of ἐπεὶ γὰρ . . . τὸν θεόν vs. 21, any more than ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν etc. vs. 23 is a mere echo of the words in vs. 21 εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός etc. And in Rom. vi. 16 οὐκ οἶδατέ, ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε would not have been a mere uttering of *idem per idem*, even had ἦτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην not been straightway annexed to δοῦλοι as a closer specification. As little do the two members of the sentence Rom. vi. 6 ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεῖν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ completely coincide in sense; the latter is the aim, concretely expressed, of what, designated generally, is the καταργηθῆναι of the σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 1 Pet. ii. 16, however, does not remotely come under this head; 2 Pet. iii. 4 also is of a different nature. On Matt. 540 v. 18 there may be a difference of opinion, inasmuch as πάντα in 6th ed. the last clause may be either referred to the law (Olsh., Mey.), or explained with Fr. universally: donec omnia (quæ mente fingere queas) evenerint. The latter, however, is not very plausible.

7. We subjoin now several other passages in which, although from of old N. T. expositors have been accustomed to assume the 635 existence of pleonasms, neither pleonasm nor redundancy of any sort occurs. And first of all, there is a statement to which currency has been given even by recent commentators, and which is propped up with misunderstood parallels from Greek authors, that in the N. T. many verbs, viz. ἀρχεσθαι, δοκεῖν, θέλειν, τολμᾶν,

δύνασθαι, when joined with an Infin., are often used pleonastically; Kühnöl on Luke i. 1 represents even ἐπιχειρεῖν to be one of them; cf. Weiske, pleon. under the words. The whole rule is founded in error. In the first place

a. With regard to Luke i. 1 ἐπιχειρεῖν in the clause ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπέχειρσαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν etc., is no more used without special meaning than is the Latin *aggredi* in *aggressus sum scribere* (though even philologists share that view, see Herbst, Xen. mem. p. 38, and on the other side, Heind. Plat. soph. p. 450). Luther well renders it: *sintemal es sich viele unterwunden haben* (*whereas many have taken it upon them*) etc. So in all the passages from the classics adduced by Kühnöl.

b. So also *τολμᾶν* (Weiske p. 121 sq.), *to undertake something*, always implies some matter of difficulty or importance, *sustinere*, *to take upon one's self* (Blume, Lycurg. p. 89), Rom. v. 7; 1 Cor. vi. 1. In Jno. xxi. 12, however, it simply means *audere*, *make bold to*; and it is only respecting the ground of their not venturing to interrogate Jesus that doubt may be entertained. The assertion⁵⁷⁰ of Markland, Lys. p. 159 ed. Taylor, ought not to have misled^{7th ed.} any expositor.

c. As to *δοκεῖν* cf. Fr. Matt. iii. 9 and the earlier critic J. D. Michaelis in the Nov. Miscell. Lips. IV. 45. In 1 Cor. x. 12 ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι is obviously, *he that thinketh he standeth*, cf. Gal. vi. 3. In Mark x. 42 οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν means, *they who pass for the rulers of the nations, are recognized as such* (similar are Gal. ii. 9; Susann. 5; Joseph. antt. 19, 6, 3. The parallel passage Matt. xx. 25 has merely οἱ ἄρχοντες). Luke xxii. 24 τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μελῶν *quis videatur habere* (*habiturus esse*) *principatum*, who was to be judged to have the pre-eminence (over the rest); the matter is still future and so merely an object of conjectural judgment. 1 Cor. xi. 16 εἴ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνηκος εἶναι *if any one thinks* (it allowable) *to be contentious*, or (Mey. and de Wette) *if any one seems to be contentious*, is an urbane expression. Luke viii. 18 ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν *what he thinks he has*. On 1 Cor. iii. 18; vii. 40; viii. 2; xiv. 37; Heb. iv. 1 (where Böhme regards *δοκεῖ* as used elegantius, while Kühnöl and Bleek judge more correctly) no remark is required. Cf. in general, Bornem. 636 schol. p. 52 sq.

d. Most of the passages in the Gospels where critics have considered ἄρχεσθαι as pleonastic (cf. too Valcken. Selecta I. 87), have been correctly explained by Fr. Mtth. p. 539 sq. cf. p. 766.

ἀνευ γὰρ δὴ τούτου, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν εὐρίσκομεν, οὐδὲν ὄφελος . . . ἐὰν μὴ καλὴ καὶ ἀγαθὴ ἡ διάνοια ἢ τῶν μελλόντων etc. Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 23). On 1 Cor. xiv. 6 see Mey. On 1 Cor. vii. 26, see above, no. 1 p. 602. On the other hand, in 1 Jno. ii. 27 ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ χρίσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς . . . καί, καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς, μενεῖτε ἐν αὐτῷ the resumptive phrase καθὼς etc. is so far from being a pleonasm, that it could hardly have been dispensed with. Similar is Rev. x. 3, 4. Cf. as to such expressions Hm.

569 Eurip. Bacch. 1060 and Soph. Antig. 691; Philoct. 269, 454;
 7th ed. Reisig, conject. Aristoph. p. 314 sq.; Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 52 and Cic. nat. d. 1, 16; Schaef. Demosth. V. 726; Mtth. 1541 f. Of a different nature is Rev. ii. 13 οἶδα ποῦ κατοικεῖς· ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ σατανᾶ, where ὅπου ὁ θρόνος etc. is immediately annexed to explain (as if in answer to) ποῦ κατοικεῖς. So might also Mark ii. 24 be taken; but τί here is probably *why*? On the other hand, 2 Cor. vii. 8; Jno. xiii. 17 do not come under this head; and in 1 Cor. i. 22 the clause ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι . . . μαρτίαν is manifestly not a mere repetition of ἐπεὶ γὰρ . . . τὸν θεόν vs. 21, any more than ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν etc. vs. 23 is a mere echo of the words in vs. 21 εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός etc. And in Rom. vi. 16 οὐκ οἶδατέ, ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοι ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε would not have been a mere uttering of *idem per idem*, even had ἦτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην not been straightway annexed to δοῦλοι as a closer specification. As little do the two members of the sentence Rom. vi. 6 ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ completely coincide in sense; the latter is the aim, concretely expressed, of what, designated generally, is the καταργηθῆναι of the σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 1 Pet. ii. 16, however, does not remotely come under this head; 2 Pet. iii. 4 also is of a different nature. On Matt.

540 v. 18 there may be a difference of opinion, inasmuch as πάντα in
 6th ed. the last clause may be either referred to the law (Olsh., Mey.), or explained with Fr. universally: donec omnia (quæ mente fingere queas) evenierint. The latter, however, is not very plausible.

7. We subjoin now several other passages in which, although from of old N. T. expositors have been accustomed to assume the
 635 existence of pleonasms, neither pleonasm nor redundancy of any sort occurs. And first of all, there is a statement to which currency has been given even by recent commentators, and which is propped up with misunderstood parallels from Greek authors, that in the N. T. many verbs, viz. ἀρχεσθαι, δοκεῖν, θέλειν, τολμᾶν,

δύνασθαι, when joined with an Infin., are often used pleonastically ; Kühnöl on Luke i. 1 represents even *ἐπιχειρεῖν* to be one of them ; cf. Weiske, pleon. under the words. The whole rule is founded in error. In the first place

a. With regard to Luke i. 1 *ἐπιχειρεῖν* in the clause *ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν* etc., is no more used without special meaning than is the Latin *aggredi* in *aggressus sum scribere* (though even philologists share that view, see Herbst, Xen. mem. p. 38, and on the other side, Heind. Plat. soph. p. 450). Luther well renders it : *sintemal es sich viele unterwunden haben* (*whereas many have taken it upon them*) etc. So in all the passages from the classics adduced by Kühnöl.

b. So also *τολμᾶν* (Weiske p. 121 sq.), *to undertake something*, always implies some matter of difficulty or importance, *sustinere*, *to take upon one's self* (Blume, Lycurg. p. 89), Rom. v. 7 ; 1 Cor. vi. 1. In Jno. xxi. 12, however, it simply means *audere*, *make bold to* ; and it is only respecting the ground of their not venturing to interrogate Jesus that doubt may be entertained. The assertion 570 of Markland, Lys. p. 159 ed. Taylor, ought not to have misled 7th ed. any expositor.

c. As to *δοκεῖν* cf. Fr. Matt. iii. 9 and the earlier critic J. D. Michaelis in the Nov. Miscell. Lips. IV. 45. In 1 Cor. x. 12 *ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι* is obviously, *he that thinketh he standeth*, cf. Gal. vi. 3. In Mark x. 42 *οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν* means, *they who pass for the rulers of the nations, are recognized as such* (similar are Gal. ii. 9 ; Susann. 5 ; Joseph. antt. 19, 6, 3. The parallel passage Matt. xx. 25 has merely *οἱ ἄρχοντες*). Luke xxii. 24 *τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων* *quis videatur habere* (*habiturus esse*) *principatum*, who was to be judged to have the pre-eminence (over the rest) ; the matter is still future and so merely an object of conjectural judgment. 1 Cor. xi. 16 *εἰ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνεκος εἶναι* *if any one thinks* (it allowable) *to be contentious*, or (Mey. and de Wette) *if any one seems to be contentious*, is an urbane expression. Luke viii. 18 *ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν* *what he thinks he has*. On 1 Cor. iii. 18 ; vii. 40 ; viii. 2 ; xiv. 37 ; Heb. iv. 1 (where Böhme regards *δοκεῖ* as used elegantius, while Kühnöl and Bleek judge more correctly) no remark is required. Cf. in general, Bornem. 636 schol. p. 52 sq.

d. Most of the passages in the Gospels where critics have considered *ἀρχεσθαι* as pleonastic (cf. too Valcken. Selecta I. 87), have been correctly explained by Fr. Mtth. p. 589 sq. cf. p. 766.

541 In regard to Luke iii. 8 Bengel hints at the truth : omnem excusa-
 6th ed. tionis etiam conatum praecidit. In particular, it is quite absurd
 to regard this verb as redundant in Luke xii. 45 ; xxi. 28 ; 2 Cor.
 iii. 1. In Jno. xiii. 5 ἤρξατο indicates the *commencement* of the
 action whose completion is related in vs. 12. Acts xxvii. 35 is
 explained by vs. 36 : Paul's ἀρχεσθαι ἐσθίειν was an invitation to
 the rest to do the same. In Acts xi. 15 Kühnöl adduces as a
 reason why ἀρξασθαι λαλεῖν must be equivalent to λαλεῖν : ex
 x. 43 patet, Petrum jam multa de rel. chr. disseruisse etc. But
 ἀρχεσθαι λαλ. primarily designates only the commencement of the
 discourse, which for that very reason has not yet been *completed*
 (Peter intended to continue to speak, x. 44 ἐτι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Π.).
 But why this commencement is to be referred solely to the first
 six or eight words is not apparent. Moreover, it must not be
 overlooked that ἐν τῷ ἀρξασθαι με λαλεῖν in an address, Acts xi.,
 is stronger, as if : scarcely had I uttered a few words, when etc.
 In Acts xviii. 26 ἤρξατο is to be connected with ἀκούσαντες δὲ αὐτοῦ
 etc. following. On Acts ii. 4 see Meyer. Likewise in Acts xxiv. 2
 the discourse of Tertullus, which to judge from the introduction
 vs. 3 was undoubtedly intended to be of greater length, probably
 was interrupted by the corroboration of the Jews vs. 9, and Paul
 himself broke in immediately after ; or vs. 2 is to be taken thus :
 as soon as he was called, Tertullus *began* etc. (began his dis-
 course forthwith).

e. In regard to θέλειν (Gataker, Mr. Ant. 10, 8) in Jno. v. 35,
 see Lücke's careful examination of the subject. More plausible
 571 is 2 Tim. iii. 12 πάντες οἱ θέλοντες εὐσεβῶς ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ.
 7th ed. But the meaning of these words is : *all who determine*, who are
 minded, *to live piously* etc. In Heb. xiii. 18 the import of θέλοντες
 is obvious. Jno. vii. 17 was correctly understood by Kühnöl.
 And in Jno. vi. 21 that expositor has rejected Bolten's arbitrary
 explanation ; a difference between it and Mark vi. 51 will have to
 be acknowledged. In 1 Cor. x. 27 καὶ θέλετε πορεύεσθαι is : *and*
you are willing, decide, to go (instead of declining the invitation).
 On 1 Pet. iii. 10 see Huther.

f. In opposition to Kühnöl, who considers δύνασθαι in Matt.
 ix. 15 as pleonastic, see Fr. By BCrus. it is erroneously made
 637 to signify *be allowed* or *desire*. Still less should the authoritative
 word *redundat* mislead us in Luke xvi. 2 and Jno. vii. 7. In the
 latter passage, in particular, there is obviously an intended
 difference between δύναται μισεῖν and μισεῖ.

Among nouns erroneously supposed to be sometimes used pleonastically, must be specially mentioned *ἔργον* when followed by a Genitive (Boisson. Nicet. p. 59) e.g. Rom. ii. 15 *ἔργον νόμου*, Eph. iv. 12; 1 Thess. i. 3 (see Koppe); see in opposition Fr. on Rom. as above. In 1 Thess., as above, the very parallelism of *ἔργον τῆς πίστεως* with *κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης* forbids our taking *ἔργον* as a pleonasm; see de Wette in loc. The correct view of Eph., as above, has already been given by Flatt. From the Greek authors, also, no instance of *ἔργον* as a pleonasm can be adduced. In Polyæn. 1, 17 *ἔργον τοῦ λογίου* undoubtedly means the matter of the oracle, the deed foretold in the oracle. In Diog. L. proœm. 1 τὸ τῆς φιλοσοφίας *ἔργον* is the occupation of philosophizing, the cultivation of philosophy, cf. 542 just afterwards *ἄρξαι φιλοσοφίας* (in Latin cf. virtutis *opus* Curt. 8, 14, 37, 6th ed. proditionis *opus* Petr. fragm. 28, 5), not precisely the fabric, system, of philosophy. *Χρῆμα* is different from *ἔργον*, and even *chrēma* with a Genitive is not properly a pleonasm, see Passow under the word. As to *ὄνομα* (very frequently regarded as pleonastic, see Kühnöl on Jno. p. 133) Wahl has already given the true view (cf. v. Hengel, Philipp. p. 160), see also my Simon. lexic. Hebr. under עֵשֶׂה; yet this word certainly requires a more precise handling than it has yet received in N. T. Lexicons. (As to a periphrastic use of *ὄνομα* in Greek poets, see Mith. 965.) In Col. ii. 16 ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων is no more pleonastic than *in respect* (or *in the matter*) of holidays, new moons, etc. Lastly, in Rom. vi. 6 σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is a single composite idea, *the body of sin*, i.e. the (human) body; respecting the relation of which to sin no reader of Paul's epistles can be at any loss. See above, p. 188.

8. Nearly all the earlier expositors asserted, that by a sort of half pleonasm *καλεῖσθαι* is used for *εἶναι* (Graev. lection. Hesiod. p. 22; Porson, Eurip. Hippol. v. 2; Blomfield, Aesch. Pers. p. 128; on the other hand, Ellendt, lexic. Soph. I. 912), in which use at the same time there was thought to be a Hebraism (אָרְבֵּי, *esse*). But Bretschn. lex. man. p. 209 sets the matter right by saying: *sum videlicet ex aliorum sententia*. Cf. van Hengel, Cor. p. 53 sq. 572 As to אָרְבֵּי see my Simon. lex. p. 867. In the N. T. *καλεῖσθαι* 7th ed. always signifies *to be named, to be called*, Jas. ii. 23; Matt. v. 19; xxi. 13, especially in reference to names of honor, which denote the possession of a certain dignity, Matt. v. 9; Luke i. 76; 1 Jno. iii. 1; Rom. ix. 26. It is used even as antithetical to *εἶναι* (*to be*), 638 1 Cor. xv. 9 (even so much as to bear the name of an apostle), Luke xv. 19. Nor can *ὀνομάζεσθαι* Rom. xv. 20 (1 Cor. v. 1); Eph. i. 21; iii. 15; v. 3 be weakened down to a mere *esse*; (it is even emphatic, as *μηδέ* in the last passage shows).¹ It is an

¹ The passages adduced by Schwarz, Comment. p. 719 sq., from Greek authors to

utter perversion when many expositors render even Heb. xi. 18 ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα: *existet tibi posteritas*; (Schulz, too, very inaccurately translates it: *thou wilt receive offspring*).

Εὐρίσκεσθαι also is said (see Pott on 1 Cor. iv. 2; cf. the annotators on Plut. educ. 13, 5), like κτῆν (cf. on the other hand my Simonis p. 575), often to be used instead of εἶναι. But these two verbs are always distinguished from each other by this, that εἶναι denotes the quality of a thing in itself, while εὐρίσκεσθαι denotes that quality as found, discovered, recognized, in the subject. Matt. i. 18 εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα *it proved (it appeared) that she was with child* (ἦν ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα might have been previously said), Luke xvii. 18 οὐχ εὐρέθησαν ὑποστρέψαντες δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος; *were none found (as it were, did none show themselves) who returned?* Acts viii. 40 Φίλιππος εὐρέθη εἰς Ἀζωτον *Philip was found (cf. πνεῦμα κυρίου ἤρπασε τὸν Φίλ. vs. 39) at Ashdod (properly, transported to Ashdod, by the πνεῦμα κύρ. that carried him away), Rom. vii. 10 εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς θάνατον it proved, appeared (from Paul's personal experience vss. 8-10) that the commandment for life had become to me a commandment for death, Gal. ii. 17 εἰ δὲ . . . εὐρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ but if we ourselves were found sinners (before God and man), 1 Cor. iv. 2; 2 Cor. v. 3; Phil. iii. 9; Rev. xii. 8 οὐδὲ τόπος εὐρέθη αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ neither was their place any more found (any more to be seen) in heaven, as we say: every trace of them was blotted out (cf. Rev. xvi. 20; xviii. 21; xx. 11), 1 Pet. ii. 22 οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ nor was guile found in his mouth, no guile could be detected in his words (Rev. xiv. 5). Phil. ii. 7 was correctly rendered by Luther. The Greek passages adduced as parallel, by Kypke I. 2; Palaioret p. 198; Schwarz et al., prove nothing. In Mr. Anton. 9, 9 τὸ συναγωγὸν ἐν τῷ κρείττονι ἐπιτευνόμενον εὐρίσκετο etc. 573 εὐρίσκομαι retains its proper meaning: *was found*. Hierocl. in carin. Pythag. p. 88 ed. Lond. ἀρχὴ μὲν τῶν ἀρετῶν ἢ φρόνησις εὐρίσκεται is: *prudentia virtutum principium esse deprehenditur*, 639 i.e. *it is found by the considerate that* etc.; Eurip. Iph. Taur. 777 (766) ποῦ ποτ' ὄνθ' εὐρήμεθα; *ubi tandem esse deprehendimur (deprehensi sumus)? whither does it turn out that we have wandered?* In Joseph. antt. 17 (not 7), 5, 8 εὐρίσκ. refers to those very persons in whose opinion Herod wished to avoid standing*

prove that καλεῖσθαι or ὀνομάζεσθαι is used for εἶναι, dispose of themselves for an attentive reader. The attempt to take *nominari* for *esse* in Cic. Flacc. 27 is truly ridiculous.

unfavorably. Cf. also Soph. Trach. 410; Aj. 1114 (1111); Diod. Sic. 3, 39; 19, 94; Athen. I. 331; Schweigh. Philostr. Apoll. 7, 11; Alciaphr. 1, 30. In Ignat. ad Rom. 3 λέγεσθαι χριστιανόν and εὐρίσκεσθαι χριστιανόν are contrasted.¹

9. Among the particles, ὥς in particular has frequently been regarded as pleonastic, as in 2 Pet. i. 3 ὥς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ . . . δεδωρημένης. But ὥς combined with the participle in the construction of the Gen. absol. imparts to the verbal notion the impress of subjectiveness, of a persuasion or purpose. Hence the preceding passage, taken in connection with vs. 5, must be rendered: *persuaded* (reflecting) *that the divine power has bestowed on us all things, . . . earnestly endeavor* etc., ἡγούμενοι, ὅτι ἡ θεία δύναμις . . . δεδῶρηται (1 Cor. iv. 18), cf. Xen. C. 3, 3, 4 ὥς εἰρήνης οὔσης *on the understanding of there being peace*, 3, 1, 9 ὥς τάληθῇ ἐροῦντος *assured that I am telling the truth*, cf. 6, 1, 37; Mem. 1, 6, 5; Strabo 9, 401; Xen. Eph. 4, 2; Dion. Hal. III. 1925; 544 see Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 320; Loesner, obs. p. 483; Lob. Soph. Aj. 6th ed. p. 203; Fr. Rom. II. 360. (In Greek authors this particle is thus connected also with the Acc. absol., e.g. Xen. C. 1, 4, 21; An. 7, 1, 40.) Ὡς is likewise, with the same import, put before a Dative governed by a verb, Acts iii. 12 ἡ ἡμῖν τί ἀτενίζετε ὥς ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει . . . πεποιηκόσιν etc. In Rom. xv. 15 ὥς ἐπαναμνησκων, the particle ὥς means *as* (of the characteristic): *as one who reminds you according to the grace of God*.

In Rom. ix. 32 ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὥς ἐξ ἔργων νόμον, the expression ἐκ πίστεως denotes the objective standard; ὥς ἐξ ἔργων, the purely imaginary. 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Jno. vii. 10; Philem. 14 also are to be traced back to a comparison. And Matt. vii. 29 ἦν διδάσκων ὥς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, Jno. i. 14 δόξαν ὥς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, mean simply: *as one having authority, as of the only begotten* etc., and even in these instances the particle does not of itself indicate what exists *revera*, though, if we regard *the sense*, 640 this idea is implied in the comparison (*exactly as, altogether as, like, i.e. the true, perfect glory of the Son of God, etc.*).

In reference to ὥς ἐπὶ Acts xvii. 14 we have to remark, that ὥς joined to a preposition of direction (ἐπὶ, πρὸς, εἰς) expresses either the actual 574 purpose of taking a certain direction, or even the mere pretence or 7th ed. assumed appearance of doing so, Kühner II. 280. In the preceding passage, Beza, Grotius, and others have understood it in the latter sense;

¹ The same applies to the Latin *invenire* (e.g. Cic. Lael. 12, 42), which Schwarz in the like clumsy way represents as equivalent to *esse*. Even in Malalas εὐρίσκεσθαι, in most passages, still retains clearly the signification of *inveniri*, e.g. 14 p. 372. So also in Theophan.; see the Index in the Bonn edition.

the former interpretation, however, is simpler and more suited to the context. As parallel instances, cf. Thuc. 5, 3; 6, 61; Xen. An. 1, 9, 23; 7, 7, 55; Diod. S. 14, 102; Polyb. 5, 70, 3; Arrian. Al. 2, 17, 2; 3, 18, 14. See besides, Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 1004. Also in *ὥς ὅτι*, in immediate succession¹ (as it were, *as that*), *ὥς* properly indicates that the statement introduced by *ὅτι* is a mere report, an alien or even pretended opinion, Isocr. Busir. argum. p. 520 *κατηγόρου· αὐτοῦ ὥς ὅτι καὶ δαίμονα εἰσφέρει*. So also 2 Thess. ii. 2 *εἰς τὸ μὴ σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς . . . μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς . . . ὥς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου*. In 2 Cor. xi. 21, likewise, this import of *ὥς* is perceptible (see Mey. in loc.), and in 2 Cor. v. 19, if the statement be regarded as the substance of the *διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς* conferred. In the earlier authors, too, *ὥς ὅτι* is thus used Xen. H. 3, 2, 14; Dion. H. III. 1776.² Among the later (Theodoret. epp. p. 1294) see Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 10 sq. and Lehrs de Aristarch. p. 34. Similar, but decidedly pleonastic, is *ὥς ἵνα* in Byzantine writers, as in Duc. 8. p. 31, 127; Jo. Canan. p. 467, 470 f. Still more strange is *ὡς ὅπως* Constant. Man. p. 62; Geo. Acropol. p. 62. (As to the earlier *ὥς οὖν*, see Bast, ep. crit. p. 43; Hm. opusc. I. 219 sq.)

545 *οὕτως* also has been said to be redundant in Jno. iv. 6 (Kühnöl): *ὁ 6th ed. Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιακῶς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοπορίας ἐκαθίζετο οὕτως*. But this adverb is frequently employed thus after a participle to repeat the participial notion: *wearied with the journey, sat down thus* (sic ut erat, in consequence of this fatigue), Xen. A. 4, 5, 29; C. 5, 2, 6; 7, 5, 71; Hellen. 7, 4, 20; Arrian. Al. 5, 27, 13; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 4. On *οὕτω* at the beginning of an apodosis, see § 60, 5 p. 541.

10. A half pleonasm of a particle is found by Palairret p. 305, after Glassius, in Acts xiii. 34 *μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν*, where *μηκέτι* is supposed to stand for the simple *μή* (as Christ had never gone to corruption). But the phrase *εἰς διαφθοράν ὑποστρέφ.* denotes, as so early a critic as Bengel perceived, simply to (die and) be buried. The quotation from Aelian. 12, 52 is of no force; *μηκέτι* there signifies: *no longer* (as hitherto), just like *οὐκέτι* in Jno. xxi. 6. Many used to teach a half pleonastic use of *οὐκέτι* also; but likewise erroneously. In Rom. vii. 17 *νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ἡ . . . ἁμαρτία* is: 575 *now, however, after having made this observation vs. 14 sqq., it is 7th ed. no longer I that do the evil, i.e. I can no longer consider myself the primary cause of it, cf. vs. 20.* Rom. xi. 6 *εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι*

¹ In Aristot. Pol. 3, 7 *ὥς ὅτι* is used differently; that is, *ὥς* corresponds to an antecedent *οὕτως*.

² For separated, so that *ὅτι* in the course of the sentence resumes *ὥς*, both particles were used at an early period, Schoem. Isae. p. 294; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 566.

ἐξ ἔργων is: *if by grace, then (it is) no more (further) of works*, i.e. the latter thought is annihilated by the former, it can no longer exist. Rom. xiv. 13, 15; 2 Cor. i. 23; Gal. ii. 20; iii. 18 are plain. In Jno. iv. 42 οὐκέτι derives elucidation from vs. 41, where διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ is antithetical to διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικός vs. 39; two motives for πιστεῖν are distinguished, an earlier and a later. As to Jno. xv. 15 see Lücke. Moreover, Xen. A. 1, 10, 12 cannot be adduced in support of such a use of οὐκέτι, and still less (μηκέτι) Xen. Eph. 1, 13 (in Paus. 8, 28, 2 recent editors give οὐκ ἔστι, yet see Siebelis in loc.). Cf. also Lucian. Parasit. 12; Sext. Emp. Math. 2, 47; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 86. Likewise on Aelian. Anim. 4, 3 Jacobs admits that οὐκέτι is used for the simple negation paullo majore cum vi.

§ 66. CONDENSED AND EXPANDED STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES
(BREVILOQUENCE, CONSTRUCTIO PRAEGNANS, ATTRACTION,
ETC.).

1. The inherent predilection of the Greeks for terseness and compactness of discourse exhibits itself even in prose in various modes of expression, some of which are to be found in the N. T. They all, however, agree in this, that an intermediate member not absolutely essential to the sense is omitted, and the other parts of the sentence are drawn together into one compound whole. Cf. Mtth. 1533 ff.; Doederlein, de brachylogia serm. gr. et lat. 546 Erlang. 1831. 4to. This breviloquence is akin to ellipsis, yet⁶⁴ different from it, inasmuch as in an elliptical sentence the grammatical structure always indicates the omission of a definite individual word, while in breviloquence the break is always covered up by the structure.

To breviloquence belong the following cases:

642

a. To a protasis is joined an apodosis without a direct connection: Rom. xi. 18 εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι, οὐ σὺ τὴν ῥίζαν βαστάξεις, ἀλλὰ ἡ ῥίζα σέ *but if thou . . . then know or reflect that, not thou*, etc. 1 Cor. xi. 16. The full structure would be: ἴσθι (διανοοῦ), ὅτι οὐ σύ etc.; cf. Clem. ad Cor. I. 55. The sentence could not be called elliptical unless it ran thus: εἰ δὲ κατακ., ὅτι οὐ σύ etc.; then ὅτι would point to an actually omitted word, such as, *know* or *consider*. In like manner, in Latin, *scito* is often suppressed between the protasis and the apodosis, Cic. or. 2, 12, 51. Cf. also 1 Jno. v. 9 εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία

576 τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων ἐστίν, we must consider that the testimony of God
 7th ed. etc., or, we must much more receive the testimony of God, which
 etc. ; 1 Cor. ix. 17. (In Rom. ii. 14, however (Fr.), the protasis
 and the apodosis are connected without any difficulty.) In Matt.
 ix. ὁ ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . (τότε
 λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ) ἐγερθεὶς ἄρῶν σου τὴν κλίνην, where the
 words inserted by the Evangelist do not belong to the structure
 of the sentence: *that ye may know . . . stand thou up and take* etc.,
 i.e. the paralytic shall at my command immediately rise up, I
 command the paralytic: Stand up etc. (analogous to this are the
 constructions so frequent in the orators, such as Dem. cor. 329 c.
 ἵνα τοίνυν εἰδῆτε, ὅτι αὐτός μοι μαρτυρεῖ . . . λαβὼν ἀνάγνωθι τὸ
 ψήφισμα ὅλον, see Kypke and Fr. in loc.). Jno. ix. 36 καὶ τίς
 ἐστι, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεῦσω εἰς αὐτόν; sc. *I wish to know, in order*
that etc., cf. i. 22.

A breviloquence similar to that in sentences with ἵνα takes place when
 through ἀλλ' ἵνα an event is referred to a prophetic prediction, as in Jno.
 xv. 25; xiii. 18; Mark xiv. 49; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9. Yet in such passages
 what is wanting before ἵνα may usually be supplied from the preceding
 context, see Fr. exc. 1. ad Matt. p. 841.

b. To a general predicate, the appropriate verb of which is
 omitted, a special verb (with its predicate) is directly annexed:
 Phil. iii. 13 f. ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ λογιζομαι κατεληφέναι, ἐν δέ, τὰ μὲν
 ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς δὲ . . . κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω etc. for ἐν δέ
 ποιῶ, κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω, cf. Liv. 35, 11 in eos sè impetum facturum
 et nihil prius (facturum), quam flammam tectis injecturum.
 2 Cor. vi. 13 τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν . . . πλατύνθητε καὶ
 ὑμεῖς for τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ ὃ ἐστὶν ἀντιμισθία etc. see Fr. diss. in 2 Cor.
 II. 115; as to the Acc., however, cf. Hm. opusc. I. 168 sq. Similar
 is Jude 5 ὅτι ὁ κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον
 648 τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. Here the verb to be connected
 547 with τὸ δεύτ. would properly have been οὐκ ἔσωσε (ἀλλά etc.):
 8th ed. the Lord, after having delivered them, did, *on a second occasion*
 (when they were in need of his helping grace), refuse them his
 delivering grace and destroy them etc. * Cf. further Rom. xi. 23
 δυνατός ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς. The αὐτοί are
 those that grew upon the stock κατὰ φύσιν; they therefore cannot
 be ingrafted on the stock *again*. In strictness the language ought
 to run: *again* to unite them to the stock, viz. by ingrafting.

On the other hand, Col. iii. 25 ὁ ἀδικῶν κομιέται δ' ἠδίκησε could hardly
 in accordance with the genius of the Greek language be regarded as

brachylogical. It denotes (according to the signification of *κομίζεσθαι*) pretty nearly: *he will reap the wrong*; not that he will suffer the same wrong which he has committed, but its fruits, the reward of it, the wrong in the form of penalty. Cf. Eph. vi. 8. Similar to this are Jno. xii. 5 διὰ τί τοῦτο τὸ μύρον οὐκ ἐπράθη . . . καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς; — and (the proceeds) 577 given to the poor (strictly, and in the form of money arising from the sale ^{7th ed.} given to the poor), and 1 Cor. xv. 37.

c. Acts i. 1 ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ἄχρι ἡς ἡμέρας etc., i.e. *what Jesus began*, and consequently continued, *to do and to teach until the day* etc. (vs. 22 ?); much like Luke xxiii. 5 διδάσκων καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἕως ὧδε *beginning from Galilee* and continuing *to this place*, and Matt. xx. 8; Jno. viii. 9; Strabo 12, 541. The construction proposed for these last passages by Fr.: διδάσκων ἕως ὧδε, ἀρξάμ. ἀπὸ τ. Γαλιλ. (Lucian. somn. 15), is too artificial. The assertion of Valckenaer, however, and Kühnöl, that in Acts i. 1 ἀρχεσθαι is pleonastic, seems to be a mere makeshift.

2. Brachylogy appears with especial frequency, and was noticed by the ancient grammarians,

d. in what is called *constructio praeagnans* (which connects a preposition with a verb that includes another as consecutive); as, 2 Tim. iv. 18 σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν *will save me into his kingdom*, i.e. *save me*, translating me into etc. Acts xxiii. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 20 (Her. 7, 230; Xen. A. 2, 3, 11; Polyb. 8, 11; Lucian. asin. 56 etc., cf. my 5th comment. de verb. compos. p. 9), 2 Tim. ii. 26 ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος, Matt. v. 22 ἐνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γένειαν (§ 81, 5 p. 213), Rom. viii. 21 ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης etc. (see Fr. in loc.), Acts v. 37 ἀπέστησε λαὸν ἱκανὸν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ, xx. 30; 2 Cor. xi. 3 μήπως . . . φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος, Acts viii. 40 Φίλ. εὐρέθη εἰς Ἀζωτον (Rom. vii. 10). See, further, Acts xxiii. 11; Luke iv. 38; xviii. 8; Gal. v. 4; Rom. vii. 2; ix. 3 (xv. 28); xvi. 20; 1 Cor. xii. 13; xv. 54; 2 Cor. x. 5; Heb. 644 ii. 3; x. 22; Eph. ii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 10. According to some, Heb. v. 7 also, comes under this head, see Bleek in loc. (Ps. xxii. 22 Hebr.; Ps. cxvii. 5 Sept.); with more certainty Mark vii. 4¹ does. This species of conciseness occurs frequently

¹ The passage must be rendered: (on returning) *from the market* (like Arrian. Epict. 3, 19, 5 ἂν μὴ εὐρωμεν φαγεῖν ἐκ βαλανείου), *if they have not washed themselves, they eat not*. To refer βαπτίζονται to the food (as Kühnöl does), would be opposed not so much by the usus loquendi (for βαπτισμός, derived from βαπτίζ, is in vs. 4 obviously

548 in Greek prose, cf. Markland, Eurip. suppl. 1205; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 60; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 292 sq.; on the Hebr., however, see Ewald S. 620. Expressions such as κρύπτειν or κλείειν τι ἀπό τινος (1 Jno. iii. 17), μετανοεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας (Acts viii. 22) or ἐκ τῶν ἔργων etc. (Rev. ix. 20 f.; xvi. 11), ἀποβλέπειν and 578 1th ed. ἀφορᾶν εἰς Heb. xi. 26; xii. 2, παραλαμβάνειν εἰς Matt. iv. 5, ἀσφαλίζεισθαι τοὺς πόδας εἰς τὸ ξύλον (Acts xvi. 24), συγκλείειν τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθείαν (Rom. xi. 32), originate in like manner from a constructio praegnans, though by us it is scarcely felt. On βαπτίζειν τινα εἰς τινα, see Fr. Rom. I. 359. In general, cf. further Fr. Mr. p. 322, also § 50, 4 p. 413 sq.

e. in what is called Zeugma (synzesis), when two nouns are construed with a single verb, though only one of them, the first, directly suits it (cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 429 sq.): 1 Cor. iii. 2 γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα, where ἐπότισα suits γάλα only, and for βρῶμα we must deduce from this verb the idea *to feed*, cf. Acta apocr. p. 60; Luke i. 64 ἀνεψύχθη τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ, where properly ἐλύθη (cf. Mark vii. 35) must be understood for γλῶσσα (and a few authorities have it), see Raphel in loc.¹ In 1 Tim. iv. 3 κωλύοντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων, the word κελυόντων (or with the Scholiast in Matthaei εἰσηγουμένων) must be deduced from κωλ. (i.q. κελεύειν μὴ) for the latter Inf.; [in the same way in 1 Thess. ii. 8 the simple verb δοῦναι from the foregoing compound μεταδοῦναι must be supplied with ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ψυχάς]. And lastly, 1 Cor. xiv. 34. Cf. Soph. Oed. R. 242; Eurip. Phoen. 1223; Plat. rep. 2, 374 b. (yet see Stallb. in loc.); 645 Protag. p. 327 c.; Demosth. cor. § 55, see Dissen in loc.; Arrian. Al. 7, 15, 5. In Greek authors, sometimes from the first verb must be deduced one of exactly the opposite import for the second member of the sentence, Kühner II. 604; Stallb. Plat. Cratyl. p. 169. This was applied to Jas. i. 9, 10, where it was thought ταπεινούσθω (or αἰσχυνέσθω)² was to be understood with ὁ δὲ

applied to *things*), or by the Mid. voice, for this might signify *wash for themselves*, as by the circumstance that in this way a very ordinary thought, and an unexpected one in the connection, is introduced. For, the washing of articles of food brought from the market was not a mere precept of Pharisaism, but a proceeding required by the nature of the case and by the spirit of the Mosaic laws concerning purification.

¹ That ἀνοίγειν γλῶσσαν could be employed in plain prose is not proved by what has been adduced by Segar in loc. We may remark also, in passing, that the zeugma usually quoted from Her. 4, 106 disappears in the edition by Schweighäus. in which the text is: ἐσθῆτα δὲ φορέουσι . . . γλῶσσαν δὲ ἰδίην ἔχουσιν. As, however, there is no MS. authority for ἔχουσιν, later editors have with reason declined to follow him.

² The passage quoted by Hottinger in loc. from Plat. rep. 2, 367 d. runs as follows,

πλούσιος. But this is unnecessary; and the thought is finer if *καυχάσθω* is made to apply also to the second member, see my *Observ.* in *ep. Jac.* p. 6. On 1 Cor. vii. 19 see above, § 64, 1 p. 583. For examples of Greek and Latin *zeugmata*, see d'Orville, *Charit.* p. 440 sq.; Wyttenb. *Plut. moral.* I. 189 sq. ed. Lips.; Schaef. *Dion.* p. 105; Engelhardt, *Plat. apol.* p. 221; Bremi, *exc.* 3 ad *Lys.*; Vlc. Fritzsche, *quaest. Lucian.* p. 132; Funkhaenel, *Demosth. Androt.* p. 70; Hand, *lat. Styl.* p. 424 f.

f. in comparisons (*Jacobs, Anthol. pal.* III. 63, 494; *Achill.* 549 *Tat.* p. 747; *Fr. Mr.* p. 147), i.e. with the Comparative (cf. § 35, ^{6th ed.} 5 p. 245) and in constructions with adjectives of resemblance, e.g. *Rev.* xiii. 11 *εἶχε κέρατα δύο ὅμοια ἀρνίῳ* (properly *ἀρνίον* 579 *κέρασι*),¹ as in *Iliad.* 17, 51 *κόμαι Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοῖαι*, *Wisdom.* ii. 15; ^{7th ed.} vii. 3; 2 *Pet.* i. 1 *τοῖς ἰσότημον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσι πίστιν* (for *ἰσότη. τῇ ἡμῶν πίστει*), *Jude* 7. Cf. also *Xen. Cyr.* 5, 1, 3 *ὁμοίαν ταῖς δούλαις εἶχε τὴν ἐσθῆτα*, 6, 1, 50 *ἄρματα ἐκ τοῦ ἵππικοῦ τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ ὅμοια ἐκείνῳ* (i.e. *τοῖς ἐκείνου*), *Iliad.* 1, 163 *οὐ μὲν σοί ποτε ἴσον ἔχω γέρας* (i.e. *ἴσον τῷ σῶ*), *Arrian. Epict.* 1, 14, 11; *Mtth.* 1016. This breviloquence in comparisons is, however, in the Greek authors much more diversified still, see *Xen. Cyr.* 5, 4, 6; 2, 1, 15; *Hier.* 1, 38; *Isocr. Evag.* c. 14; *Diod. S.* 3, 18; *Ael. anim.* 4, 21; *Dion. H. I.* 111; see Wyttenb. *Plut. Mor.* I. 480 sq.; Schaef. *Apollon. Rhod.* II. 164; *melet.* p. 57; *Demosth.* III. 463; *Stallb. Plat. Protag.* p. 153; *rep. I.* 134, also *Heinichen, Euseb.* II. 154. In the N. T. under this head come also 1 *Jno.* iii. 11 f. *αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία ἦν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους· οὐ καθὼς Κάιν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν* etc. Strictly, there is nothing to be supplied (*ᾧμεν* or *ποιῶμεν* would not suit *οὐ*), but the comparison is expressed carelessly, and the reader easily sets it to rights for himself: *that we love each other, not as Cain was of the wicked one* 646 etc. will, or should, it be with us.²

Luke xiii. 1 *ὢν τὸ αἷμα Πιλάτος ἔμειξε μετὰ τῶν θυνῶν αὐτῶν* (for *μετὰ*

in the recent editions, agreeably to MS. authority: *τοῦτ' ὅν αὐτὸ ἐπαίνεσον δικαιοσύνης, ὃ αὐτὴ δι' αὐτὴν τὸν ἔχοντα ἐνίκησι καὶ ἀδικία βλάπτει*; and is thus no longer similar.

¹ *Rev.* ix. 10 probably does not come under this head. The comparing of tails to scorpions is nearly in the style of the poet, and is sustained by other passages, see vs. 19 and cf. *Züllig* in loc.

² Cf. *Demosth. Mid.* p. 415 a. *οὐ γὰρ ἐκ πολιτικῆς αἰτίας, οὐδ' ὅσπερ Ἀριστοφῶν ἀποδοῦς τοὺς στεφάνους ἔλυσε τὴν προβολήν* not on account of a political offence, and did not like A. ... quash the proceeding, i.e. nor acting in the way by which A. quashed the impeachment. In opposition to *Reiske*, who would here insert *ὅς*, see *Spalding* in loc.

τοῦ αἵματος τῶν θ.?) may also be referred to this head, though not necessarily; see Meyer.

8. g. It may be considered as breviloquence also, when a word which should have a clause of its own is directly appended (or even prefixed) to a clause as an apposition; e.g. 2 Tim. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 3 etc. (see § 59, 9 p. 533) and (according to the usual reading) Mark vii. 19 εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα. Akin to this is the proleptic use of adjectiva effectus (in a sort of apposition), as in Soph. Oed. Col. 1202 τῶν σῶν ἀδέρκτων ὁμμάτων τητῶμενος for ὥστε γενέσθαι ἀδερκτα. This usage is not merely poetic and oratorical, Schaefer. Demosth. I. 239; V. 641; Erfurdt, Soph. Antig. 786; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 278; Heller, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 522 sqq., — but is used also in prose, Ast, Plat. legg. p. 150 sq.; Plat. polit. p. 592; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaestion. 550 Lucian. p. 39, 57; Weber, Demosth. 497. See, in general, Meyer 6th ed. de epithet. ornant. p. 24 and Ahlemeyer Pr. on the poetic prolepsis 580 of the Adject. Paderborn 1827. 4to. From the N. T. might be 7th ed. referred to this head, Matt. xii. 13 (ἡ χεὶρ) ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑγιής (Bornem. schol. p. 39; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 76; my Simonis p. 262), Rom. i. 21 ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδιά, 2 Cor. iv. 4 θεὸς ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, 1 Thess. iii. 13 στηρίζαι τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ἀμέμπτους etc., Phil. iii. 21 μετασχηματίζει τὸ σῶμα . . . ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι etc. (where some Codd. subjoin after ἡμῶν: εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτό), 1 Cor. i. 8. This construction, however, is hardly admissible, at least in respect to Rom. i. and 2 Cor. iv. In the former passage the import of ἀσύνετος (having reference to ἐματαιώθησαν preceding) is less strong than that of σκοτίζεσθαι (as Flatt perceived), and in 2 Cor. Paul probably conceives of enlightenment as proceeding from a general faith in Christ. Because they did not turn to Christ, but at once rejected him, they did not obtain enlightenment.

With the instances first adduced must be classed also Luke xxiv. 47 εἶδε παθεῖν Χριστὸν . . . καὶ ἀναστῆναι . . . καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ 647 μετάνοιαν, . . . ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, where the participle (as frequently ἐξόν, παρόν Vig. p. 329) is used absolutely and impersonally: *whilst* (so that) *it was begun*, cf. Her. 3, 91 ἀπὸ δὲ Ποσειδηίου πόλιος . . . ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ ταύτης μέχρι Αἰγύπτου . . . πεντήκοντα καὶ τριηκόσια τάλαντα φόρος ἦν, see J. L. Schlosser, vindicat. N. T. locor., quor. integritatem J. Marcland. suspectam reddere non dubitavit (Hamb. 1732. 4to.) p. 18 sq. This English critic (ad Lysiam p. 653, Reiske VI.) wanted to read ἀρξαμένην.

A sort of breviloquence occurs in Acts i. 21 ἐν παρὶ χρόνῳ, (ἐν) ᾧ εἰς-

ἦλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς for εἰσῆλθε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐξῆλθε ἀφ' ἡμῶν. But such diffuseness would have been intolerable to every classic author also, cf. Eurip. Phoen. 536 ἐς οἴκου εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθε (where to be sure the arrangement is more simple) and Valcken. in loc. See also Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 289.

Note. In Acts x. 39 there would in like manner be a brachylogy in the words καὶ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν ..., ὃν καὶ (the reading according to the best authorities [Cod. Sin. also]) ἀνείλον κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου, if the meaning were: *we are witnesses of all that he did, also of this, that they put him to death.* But this acceptance is not necessary. Besides, whatever opinion others may hold, καί here means nothing else than *etiam* (adeo), and the rendering *tamen* (Kühnöl) is in this connection very doubtful. Likewise Luke xxiv. 21 τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον, cf. 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1, could only be regarded as a brachylogy by taking German as the standard. In Greek the numeral was considered simply as a predicative adjunct, cf. Achill. Tat. 7, 11 Jac. τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν γέγονεν ἀφανής, Dion. Hal. IV. 2095 τριακοστὸν ἔτος τοῦτο ἀνεχόμεθα etc. see Bornem. Luc. p. 161 and on analogous cases Krü. 237. Further, there is no brachylogy in 1 Cor. i. 12 ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει· ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλώ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ. In these four 581 statements Paul intended to comprehend all the declarations current in the church respecting religious partisanship; *each* uses one of the following 551 expressions. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Lastly, 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτά τιμες ἦτε, 614 ed. rightly understood, contains no brachylogy, see § 58, 3 p. 513.

4. But the Greek language has a method of blending sentences and parts of sentences so as to give discourse still greater compactness and conciseness, viz. by means of what is called *Attraction* (Bttm. Gr. § 538, 1), which can be termed a species of brachylogy only under one point of view. The name of Attraction, as is well known, has been given by modern grammarians to that mode of expression by means of which two portions of discourse (especially clauses), logically (in sense) connected, are also grammatically (formally) blended. A word (or assemblage of words), which properly belongs to but one of these portions (clauses), is gram- 648 matically extended to the other, and so applies to both at once (to the one clause, logically, and to the other, grammatically), as *urbem, quam statuo, vestra est*; where *urbs* properly belongs to *vestra est* (for there are two propositions: *urbs vestra est*, and *quam statuo*), but is *attracted* by the relative clause and incorporated into it, so as now to belong to both clauses, logically to *vestra est*, and grammatically to *quam statuo*. See Hm. Vig. p. 891 sqq.,¹

¹ Hm. as above: Est attractio in eo posita, si quid eo, quod simul ad duas orationis partes refertur, ad quarum alteram non recte refertur, ambas in unam conjungit. Cf.

in particular G. T. A. Krüger, gramm. Untersuch. 3 Theil. The copious diversity of this mode of expression encountered in Greek authors, does not, indeed, occur in the N. T.; yet even there we find not a few instances of attraction which were not recognized as such by the earlier expositors, and which, to say the least, created no small difficulty in interpretation (see e.g. W. Bowyer, Conjectur. I. 147).

5. Attraction in general, so far as it affects the connection of sentences or clauses, may be reduced to three principal sorts: Either, 1. something is attracted from the dependent by the principal clause; or, 2. the principal clause transfers something to the dependent (accessory) clause; or, 3. two clauses, predicated of one and the same subject, are blended into one.

The 1st sort comprehends such constructions as the following:

- a. 1 Cor. xvi. 15 οἴδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανῶ ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχατίας, Acts ix. 20 ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. This is very frequent, when objective clauses follow a verb of observing, knowing, showing, or declaring, as Mark xi. 32; xii. 34; Acts iii. 10; iv. 13; xiii. 32; xv. 36; xvi. 3; xxvi. 5; 1 Cor. iii. 20; xiv. 37; 2 Cor. xii. 3 f.; 1 Thess. ii. 1; 2 Thess. 582 ii. 4; Jno. iv. 35; v. 42; vii. 27; viii. 54 (Arrian. Al. 7, 15, 7); 7th ed. xi. 31; Rev. xvii. 8 (Gen. i. 4; 1 Macc. xiii. 53; 2 Macc. ii. 1; 1 Kings v. 3; xi. 28, etc.). Also when interrogative clauses follow, 552 as Luke iv. 34 οἰδὰ σε, τίς εἶ, Mark i. 24 (see Heupel and Fr. in 6th ed. loc.; Boissonade, Philostr. opp. p. 143), Luke xix. 3 ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, τίς ἐστι, cf. Schaef. ind. Aesop. p. 127;¹ Jno. vii. 27 τοῦτον οἶδαμεν, πόθεν ἐστὶν (Kypke in loc.), Acts xv. 36 ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφούς . . . πῶς ἔχουσι, 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Jno. xiii. 28 (Achill. Tat. 1, 19; Theophr. char. 21; Philostr. ep. 64). And the same form of anticipation occurs from clauses with ἵνα, μή etc. 649 Col. iv. 17 βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς, Rev. iii. 9 ποιήσω αὐτούς, ἵνα ἤξουσιν, Gal. vi. 1 σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν, μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς, iv. 11 φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μήπως εἰκὴ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς (cf. Diod. S. 4, 40 τὸν ἀδελφὸν εὐλαβεῖσθαι, μήποτε . . . ἐπίθῃται τῇ βασιλείᾳ, Soph. Oed. R. 760 δέδουκ' ἔμαντόν . . . μὴ πόλλ' ἄγαν εἰρημέν' ᾗ μοι, Thuc. 3, 53; Ignat. ad Rom. I. φοβοῦμαι τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην, μὴ αὐτὴ με ἀδικήσῃ, Varro R. R. 3, 10, 6; Caes. b. gall. 1, 39; cf. Krü. S. 164 f.). In the Passive 1 Cor. xv. 12 Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται

Krüg. as above, S. 39 f. Many draw a distinction between assimilation and attraction, cf. Hand, Lat. Styl. 376 ff.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 2 does not come under this head, see § 61, 7 p. 561.

ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται. See, in general, J. A. Lehmann de graec. ling. transp. (Danz. 1832. 4to.) p. 18 sqq.; Schwartz, de soloec. p. 97.¹ As to Hebr. see Gesen. Lgb. 854.

b. Rom. i. 22 *φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν*, 2 Pet. ii. 21 *κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι . . . ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ἐπιστρέφειν* etc. § 44, 2 p. 320; Kühner II. 355. This sort of attraction has not been adopted in Acts xv. 22, 25 (Elsner, obs. I. 428 sq.); xxvi. 20; Heb. ii. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Luke i. 74; cf. Bremi, Aeschin. fals. leg. p. 196.

c. Acts xvi. 34 *ἡγαλλιάσατο πεπιστευκῶς τῷ θεῷ*, 1 Cor. xiv. 18 *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶν* (var.), see § 45, 4 p. 345.

d. The most simple attraction, but one of very frequent occurrence, is that in which a relative, instead of being put in the case (Acc.) required by the verb of the relative clause, is made to correspond to the verb of the principal clause, and consequently is put in the case governed by it: Jno. ii. 22 *ἐπίστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν* (for *ὃν*), see § 24, 1 p. 163.

e. Lastly, under this head would come 1 Pet. iv. 3 *ἀρκετὸς ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατεργάσθαι*, if, with Wahl, we were to resolve it thus: *ἀρκετόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν, τὸν χρόνον . . . κατεργ.* cf. Bttm. § 138, 1, 7. But there is no need of such nicety.

On the other hand it should not be said that in Phil. i. 7 *δικαίον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖν* etc. attraction is neglected (*δικαίος εἰμι τ. φρον.*) Mtth. 756, for the Greeks also use *δικαίόν ἐστι* with the Infin. impersonally; only they are less accustomed to connect with it the Dat. of the person, than to connect the personal word with the Infin. and put it in the Acc. Her. 1, 39. The former is the more simple and natural construction.

2) The simplest form in which a subordinate clause exerts an attraction on the principal clause is when the relative pronoun, which should agree in number and gender with the noun of the principal clause, agrees in these respects with the noun of the subordinate clause; as, 1 Tim. iii. 15 *ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία*, Rom. ix. 24 (*σκεύη ἐλέους*) *οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς*. In the following cases the attraction is carried still farther:

¹ *Anticipation* is properly to be admitted only when the author applied beforehand to the subject the subsequent predication in the accessory clause. On the contrary, particularly when parenthetical clauses intervene, e.g. Acts xv. 36 the construction *ἐπισκεψάμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφούς* may at first have been alone intended, and *τῶς ἔχουσιν* subjoined merely for further explanation.

650 a. 1 Cor. x. 16 τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος etc., Jno. vi. 29 ἵνα πιστεύσητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, see § 24, 2 a. pp. 164, 166, or Mark vi. 16 ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτός ἐστιν, see § 24, 2 b. p. 164, cf. Matt. vii. 9.

b. 1 Jno. ii. 25 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγέλτατο ἡμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον for ζωὴ in apposition to ἐπαγγελία 553 (see § 59, 7 p. 530), Philem. 10 f.; Rom. iv. 24 ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς, οἷς 6th ed. μέλλει λογίζεσθαι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν etc. (Rev. xvii. 8 var.?). Luther understood Phil. iii. 18 also thus. Cf. further, Fr. Mr. 328; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 216; II. 146; Kühn. II. 515.

c. Matt. x. 25 ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ for καὶ τῷ δούλῳ (ἵνα γέν.) ὡς ὁ κύρ. etc.

d. Rom. iii. 8 τί ἔτι ἐγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; καὶ μή, καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασὶ τινας ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά, ἵνα etc., where the apostle ought to have made ποιῶν κακά etc. dependent on καὶ μή, but, misled by the parenthesis, appends it to λέγειν in oratio recta. The same construction occurs not unfrequently in Greek authors, particularly in connection with a relative clause, see Hm. Vig. 743; Krüg. Unters. 457 ff.; Dissen, Dem. cor. 177, and on the Latin usage, Beier, Cic. off. I. 50 sq.; Grotefend, ausf. Gr. 462 f.

3) Two interrogative clauses following one another as predicates of one and the same subject are blended into one; as, Acts xi. 17 ἐγὼ δὲ τίς ἤμην δυνατὸς κωλύσαι τὸν θεόν; but I, who was I? had I power to withstand God? Cf. Cic. N. D. 1, 27, 78 quid censes, si ratio esset in belluis, non suo quasque generi plurimum tributuras fuisse? Luke xix. 15 τίς τί διεπραγματεύσατο; Mark xv. 24 τίς τί ἄρη; see Hm. Soph. Aj. 1164; Eurip. Io 807; Lob. Soph. Aj. 454 sq.; Ellendt, lexic. Soph. II. 824; Weber, Demosth. p. 348 (as to Latin, Grotefend, ausf. Gram. II. 96; Kritz, Sallust. I. 211). For other modes of blending interrogative clauses by attraction, see Kühner II. 588 f. An interrogative and a relative clause are blended in Luke xvi. 2 τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ; quid est quod de te audio, see Bornem. in loc. Similar is Acts xiv. 15 τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε;

Luke i. 73 also I consider as an attraction: μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἀγίας αὐτοῦ, ὅρκον (for ὅρκου) ὃν ὤμοσε etc. Others, as Kühnöl, find here a double construction of μνησθῆναι, which in the Sept. is also construed with the Acc. Gen. ix. 16; Exod. xx. 8, — a view previously adopted by an 651 anonymous writer in the Alt. und Neu. for 1735. S. 336 f. 2 Pet. ii. 12

ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι βλασφημοῦντες is probably to be resolved: ἐν τούτοις, ⁵⁸⁴ ἀγνοοῦσι, βλασφ. A similar construction, βλασφ. εἰς τινα, is of frequent occurrence (§ 32, 1 p. 222), cf. ² Sam. xxiii. 9, ³ ⁴ ⁵ ⁶ ⁷ ⁸ ⁹ ¹⁰ ¹¹ ¹² ¹³ ¹⁴ ¹⁵ ¹⁶ ¹⁷ ¹⁸ ¹⁹ ²⁰ ²¹ ²² ²³ ²⁴ ²⁵ ²⁶ ²⁷ ²⁸ ²⁹ ³⁰ ³¹ ³² ³³ ³⁴ ³⁵ ³⁶ ³⁷ ³⁸ ³⁹ ⁴⁰ ⁴¹ ⁴² ⁴³ ⁴⁴ ⁴⁵ ⁴⁶ ⁴⁷ ⁴⁸ ⁴⁹ ⁵⁰ ⁵¹ ⁵² ⁵³ ⁵⁴ ⁵⁵ ⁵⁶ ⁵⁷ ⁵⁸ ⁵⁹ ⁶⁰ ⁶¹ ⁶² ⁶³ ⁶⁴ ⁶⁵ ⁶⁶ ⁶⁷ ⁶⁸ ⁶⁹ ⁷⁰ ⁷¹ ⁷² ⁷³ ⁷⁴ ⁷⁵ ⁷⁶ ⁷⁷ ⁷⁸ ⁷⁹ ⁸⁰ ⁸¹ ⁸² ⁸³ ⁸⁴ ⁸⁵ ⁸⁶ ⁸⁷ ⁸⁸ ⁸⁹ ⁹⁰ ⁹¹ ⁹² ⁹³ ⁹⁴ ⁹⁵ ⁹⁶ ⁹⁷ ⁹⁸ ⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰ ¹⁰¹ ¹⁰² ¹⁰³ ¹⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁷ ¹⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁹ ¹¹⁰ ¹¹¹ ¹¹² ¹¹³ ¹¹⁴ ¹¹⁵ ¹¹⁶ ¹¹⁷ ¹¹⁸ ¹¹⁹ ¹²⁰ ¹²¹ ¹²² ¹²³ ¹²⁴ ¹²⁵ ¹²⁶ ¹²⁷ ¹²⁸ ¹²⁹ ¹³⁰ ¹³¹ ¹³² ¹³³ ¹³⁴ ¹³⁵ ¹³⁶ ¹³⁷ ¹³⁸ ¹³⁹ ¹⁴⁰ ¹⁴¹ ¹⁴² ¹⁴³ ¹⁴⁴ ¹⁴⁵ ¹⁴⁶ ¹⁴⁷ ¹⁴⁸ ¹⁴⁹ ¹⁵⁰ ¹⁵¹ ¹⁵² ¹⁵³ ¹⁵⁴ ¹⁵⁵ ¹⁵⁶ ¹⁵⁷ ¹⁵⁸ ¹⁵⁹ ¹⁶⁰ ¹⁶¹ ¹⁶² ¹⁶³ ¹⁶⁴ ¹⁶⁵ ¹⁶⁶ ¹⁶⁷ ¹⁶⁸ ¹⁶⁹ ¹⁷⁰ ¹⁷¹ ¹⁷² ¹⁷³ ¹⁷⁴ ¹⁷⁵ ¹⁷⁶ ¹⁷⁷ ¹⁷⁸ ¹⁷⁹ ¹⁸⁰ ¹⁸¹ ¹⁸² ¹⁸³ ¹⁸⁴ ¹⁸⁵ ¹⁸⁶ ¹⁸⁷ ¹⁸⁸ ¹⁸⁹ ¹⁹⁰ ¹⁹¹ ¹⁹² ¹⁹³ ¹⁹⁴ ¹⁹⁵ ¹⁹⁶ ¹⁹⁷ ¹⁹⁸ ¹⁹⁹ ²⁰⁰ ²⁰¹ ²⁰² ²⁰³ ²⁰⁴ ²⁰⁵ ²⁰⁶ ²⁰⁷ ²⁰⁸ ²⁰⁹ ²¹⁰ ²¹¹ ²¹² ²¹³ ²¹⁴ ²¹⁵ ²¹⁶ ²¹⁷ ²¹⁸ ²¹⁹ ²²⁰ ²²¹ ²²² ²²³ ²²⁴ ²²⁵ ²²⁶ ²²⁷ ²²⁸ ²²⁹ ²³⁰ ²³¹ ²³² ²³³ ²³⁴ ²³⁵ ²³⁶ ²³⁷ ²³⁸ ²³⁹ ²⁴⁰ ²⁴¹ ²⁴² ²⁴³ ²⁴⁴ ²⁴⁵ ²⁴⁶ ²⁴⁷ ²⁴⁸ ²⁴⁹ ²⁵⁰ ²⁵¹ ²⁵² ²⁵³ ²⁵⁴ ²⁵⁵ ²⁵⁶ ²⁵⁷ ²⁵⁸ ²⁵⁹ ²⁶⁰ ²⁶¹ ²⁶² ²⁶³ ²⁶⁴ ²⁶⁵ ²⁶⁶ ²⁶⁷ ²⁶⁸ ²⁶⁹ ²⁷⁰ ²⁷¹ ²⁷² ²⁷³ ²⁷⁴ ²⁷⁵ ²⁷⁶ ²⁷⁷ ²⁷⁸ ²⁷⁹ ²⁸⁰ ²⁸¹ ²⁸² ²⁸³ ²⁸⁴ ²⁸⁵ ²⁸⁶ ²⁸⁷ ²⁸⁸ ²⁸⁹ ²⁹⁰ ²⁹¹ ²⁹² ²⁹³ ²⁹⁴ ²⁹⁵ ²⁹⁶ ²⁹⁷ ²⁹⁸ ²⁹⁹ ³⁰⁰ ³⁰¹ ³⁰² ³⁰³ ³⁰⁴ ³⁰⁵ ³⁰⁶ ³⁰⁷ ³⁰⁸ ³⁰⁹ ³¹⁰ ³¹¹ ³¹² ³¹³ ³¹⁴ ³¹⁵ ³¹⁶ ³¹⁷ ³¹⁸ ³¹⁹ ³²⁰ ³²¹ ³²² ³²³ ³²⁴ ³²⁵ ³²⁶ ³²⁷ ³²⁸ ³²⁹ ³³⁰ ³³¹ ³³² ³³³ ³³⁴ ³³⁵ ³³⁶ ³³⁷ ³³⁸ ³³⁹ ³⁴⁰ ³⁴¹ ³⁴² ³⁴³ ³⁴⁴ ³⁴⁵ ³⁴⁶ ³⁴⁷ ³⁴⁸ ³⁴⁹ ³⁵⁰ ³⁵¹ ³⁵² ³⁵³ ³⁵⁴ ³⁵⁵ ³⁵⁶ ³⁵⁷ ³⁵⁸ ³⁵⁹ ³⁶⁰ ³⁶¹ ³⁶² ³⁶³ ³⁶⁴ ³⁶⁵ ³⁶⁶ ³⁶⁷ ³⁶⁸ ³⁶⁹ ³⁷⁰ ³⁷¹ ³⁷² ³⁷³ ³⁷⁴ ³⁷⁵ ³⁷⁶ ³⁷⁷ ³⁷⁸ ³⁷⁹ ³⁸⁰ ³⁸¹ ³⁸² ³⁸³ ³⁸⁴ ³⁸⁵ ³⁸⁶ ³⁸⁷ ³⁸⁸ ³⁸⁹ ³⁹⁰ ³⁹¹ ³⁹² ³⁹³ ³⁹⁴ ³⁹⁵ ³⁹⁶ ³⁹⁷ ³⁹⁸ ³⁹⁹ ⁴⁰⁰ ⁴⁰¹ ⁴⁰² ⁴⁰³ ⁴⁰⁴ ⁴⁰⁵ ⁴⁰⁶ ⁴⁰⁷ ⁴⁰⁸ ⁴⁰⁹ ⁴¹⁰ ⁴¹¹ ⁴¹² ⁴¹³ ⁴¹⁴ ⁴¹⁵ ⁴¹⁶ ⁴¹⁷ ⁴¹⁸ ⁴¹⁹ ⁴²⁰ ⁴²¹ ⁴²² ⁴²³ ⁴²⁴ ⁴²⁵ ⁴²⁶ ⁴²⁷ ⁴²⁸ ⁴²⁹ ⁴³⁰ ⁴³¹ ⁴³² ⁴³³ ⁴³⁴ ⁴³⁵ ⁴³⁶ ⁴³⁷ ⁴³⁸ ⁴³⁹ ⁴⁴⁰ ⁴⁴¹ ⁴⁴² ⁴⁴³ ⁴⁴⁴ ⁴⁴⁵ ⁴⁴⁶ ⁴⁴⁷ ⁴⁴⁸ ⁴⁴⁹ ⁴⁵⁰ ⁴⁵¹ ⁴⁵² ⁴⁵³ ⁴⁵⁴ ⁴⁵⁵ ⁴⁵⁶ ⁴⁵⁷ ⁴⁵⁸ ⁴⁵⁹ ⁴⁶⁰ ⁴⁶¹ ⁴⁶² ⁴⁶³ ⁴⁶⁴ ⁴⁶⁵ ⁴⁶⁶ ⁴⁶⁷ ⁴⁶⁸ ⁴⁶⁹ ⁴⁷⁰ ⁴⁷¹ ⁴⁷² ⁴⁷³ ⁴⁷⁴ ⁴⁷⁵ ⁴⁷⁶ ⁴⁷⁷ ⁴⁷⁸ ⁴⁷⁹ ⁴⁸⁰ ⁴⁸¹ ⁴⁸² ⁴⁸³ ⁴⁸⁴ ⁴⁸⁵ ⁴⁸⁶ ⁴⁸⁷ ⁴⁸⁸ ⁴⁸⁹ ⁴⁹⁰ ⁴⁹¹ ⁴⁹² ⁴⁹³ ⁴⁹⁴ ⁴⁹⁵ ⁴⁹⁶ ⁴⁹⁷ ⁴⁹⁸ ⁴⁹⁹ ⁵⁰⁰ ⁵⁰¹ ⁵⁰² ⁵⁰³ ⁵⁰⁴ ⁵⁰⁵ ⁵⁰⁶ ⁵⁰⁷ ⁵⁰⁸ ⁵⁰⁹ ⁵¹⁰ ⁵¹¹ ⁵¹² ⁵¹³ ⁵¹⁴ ⁵¹⁵ ⁵¹⁶ ⁵¹⁷ ⁵¹⁸ ⁵¹⁹ ⁵²⁰ ⁵²¹ ⁵²² ⁵²³ ⁵²⁴ ⁵²⁵ ⁵²⁶ ⁵²⁷ ⁵²⁸ ⁵²⁹ ⁵³⁰ ⁵³¹ ⁵³² ⁵³³ ⁵³⁴ ⁵³⁵ ⁵³⁶ ⁵³⁷ ⁵³⁸ ⁵³⁹ ⁵⁴⁰ ⁵⁴¹ ⁵⁴² ⁵⁴³ ⁵⁴⁴ ⁵⁴⁵ ⁵⁴⁶ ⁵⁴⁷ ⁵⁴⁸ ⁵⁴⁹ ⁵⁵⁰ ⁵⁵¹ ⁵⁵² ⁵⁵³ ⁵⁵⁴ ⁵⁵⁵ ⁵⁵⁶ ⁵⁵⁷ ⁵⁵⁸ ⁵⁵⁹ ⁵⁶⁰ ⁵⁶¹ ⁵⁶² ⁵⁶³ ⁵⁶⁴ ⁵⁶⁵ ⁵⁶⁶ ⁵⁶⁷ ⁵⁶⁸ ⁵⁶⁹ ⁵⁷⁰ ⁵⁷¹ ⁵⁷² ⁵⁷³ ⁵⁷⁴ ⁵⁷⁵ ⁵⁷⁶ ⁵⁷⁷ ⁵⁷⁸ ⁵⁷⁹ ⁵⁸⁰ ⁵⁸¹ ⁵⁸² ⁵⁸³ ⁵⁸⁴ ⁵⁸⁵ ⁵⁸⁶ ⁵⁸⁷ ⁵⁸⁸ ⁵⁸⁹ ⁵⁹⁰ ⁵⁹¹ ⁵⁹² ⁵⁹³ ⁵⁹⁴ ⁵⁹⁵ ⁵⁹⁶ ⁵⁹⁷ ⁵⁹⁸ ⁵⁹⁹ ⁶⁰⁰ ⁶⁰¹ ⁶⁰² ⁶⁰³ ⁶⁰⁴ ⁶⁰⁵ ⁶⁰⁶ ⁶⁰⁷ ⁶⁰⁸ ⁶⁰⁹ ⁶¹⁰ ⁶¹¹ ⁶¹² ⁶¹³ ⁶¹⁴ ⁶¹⁵ ⁶¹⁶ ⁶¹⁷ ⁶¹⁸ ⁶¹⁹ ⁶²⁰ ⁶²¹ ⁶²² ⁶²³ ⁶²⁴ ⁶²⁵ ⁶²⁶ ⁶²⁷ ⁶²⁸ ⁶²⁹ ⁶³⁰ ⁶³¹ ⁶³² ⁶³³ ⁶³⁴ ⁶³⁵ ⁶³⁶ ⁶³⁷ ⁶³⁸ ⁶³⁹ ⁶⁴⁰ ⁶⁴¹ ⁶⁴² ⁶⁴³ ⁶⁴⁴ ⁶⁴⁵ ⁶⁴⁶ ⁶⁴⁷ ⁶⁴⁸ ⁶⁴⁹ ⁶⁵⁰ ⁶⁵¹ ⁶⁵² ⁶⁵³ ⁶⁵⁴ ⁶⁵⁵ ⁶⁵⁶ ⁶⁵⁷ ⁶⁵⁸ ⁶⁵⁹ ⁶⁶⁰ ⁶⁶¹ ⁶⁶² ⁶⁶³ ⁶⁶⁴ ⁶⁶⁵ ⁶⁶⁶ ⁶⁶⁷ ⁶⁶⁸ ⁶⁶⁹ ⁶⁷⁰ ⁶⁷¹ ⁶⁷² ⁶⁷³ ⁶⁷⁴ ⁶⁷⁵ ⁶⁷⁶ ⁶⁷⁷ ⁶⁷⁸ ⁶⁷⁹ ⁶⁸⁰ ⁶⁸¹ ⁶⁸² ⁶⁸³ ⁶⁸⁴ ⁶⁸⁵ ⁶⁸⁶ ⁶⁸⁷ ⁶⁸⁸ ⁶⁸⁹ ⁶⁹⁰ ⁶⁹¹ ⁶⁹² ⁶⁹³ ⁶⁹⁴ ⁶⁹⁵ ⁶⁹⁶ ⁶⁹⁷ ⁶⁹⁸ ⁶⁹⁹ ⁷⁰⁰ ⁷⁰¹ ⁷⁰² ⁷⁰³ ⁷⁰⁴ ⁷⁰⁵ ⁷⁰⁶ ⁷⁰⁷ ⁷⁰⁸ ⁷⁰⁹ ⁷¹⁰ ⁷¹¹ ⁷¹² ⁷¹³ ⁷¹⁴ ⁷¹⁵ ⁷¹⁶ ⁷¹⁷ ⁷¹⁸ ⁷¹⁹ ⁷²⁰ ⁷²¹ ⁷²² ⁷²³ ⁷²⁴ ⁷²⁵ ⁷²⁶ ⁷²⁷ ⁷²⁸ ⁷²⁹ ⁷³⁰ ⁷³¹ ⁷³² ⁷³³ ⁷³⁴ ⁷³⁵ ⁷³⁶ ⁷³⁷ ⁷³⁸ ⁷³⁹ ⁷⁴⁰ ⁷⁴¹ ⁷⁴² ⁷⁴³ ⁷⁴⁴ ⁷⁴⁵ ⁷⁴⁶ ⁷⁴⁷ ⁷⁴⁸ ⁷⁴⁹ ⁷⁵⁰ ⁷⁵¹ ⁷⁵² ⁷⁵³ ⁷⁵⁴ ⁷⁵⁵ ⁷⁵⁶ ⁷⁵⁷ ⁷⁵⁸ ⁷⁵⁹ ⁷⁶⁰ ⁷⁶¹ ⁷⁶² ⁷⁶³ ⁷⁶⁴ ⁷⁶⁵ ⁷⁶⁶ ⁷⁶⁷ ⁷⁶⁸ ⁷⁶⁹ ⁷⁷⁰ ⁷⁷¹ ⁷⁷² ⁷⁷³ ⁷⁷⁴ ⁷⁷⁵ ⁷⁷⁶ ⁷⁷⁷ ⁷⁷⁸ ⁷⁷⁹ ⁷⁸⁰ ⁷⁸¹ ⁷⁸² ⁷⁸³ ⁷⁸⁴ ⁷⁸⁵ ⁷⁸⁶ ⁷⁸⁷ ⁷⁸⁸ ⁷⁸⁹ ⁷⁹⁰ ⁷⁹¹ ⁷⁹² ⁷⁹³ ⁷⁹⁴ ⁷⁹⁵ ⁷⁹⁶ ⁷⁹⁷ ⁷⁹⁸ ⁷⁹⁹ ⁸⁰⁰ ⁸⁰¹ ⁸⁰² ⁸⁰³ ⁸⁰⁴ ⁸⁰⁵ ⁸⁰⁶ ⁸⁰⁷ ⁸⁰⁸ ⁸⁰⁹ ⁸¹⁰ ⁸¹¹ ⁸¹² ⁸¹³ ⁸¹⁴ ⁸¹⁵ ⁸¹⁶ ⁸¹⁷ ⁸¹⁸ ⁸¹⁹ ⁸²⁰ ⁸²¹ ⁸²² ⁸²³ ⁸²⁴ ⁸²⁵ ⁸²⁶ ⁸²⁷ ⁸²⁸ ⁸²⁹ ⁸³⁰ ⁸³¹ ⁸³² ⁸³³ ⁸³⁴ ⁸³⁵ ⁸³⁶ ⁸³⁷ ⁸³⁸ ⁸³⁹ ⁸⁴⁰ ⁸⁴¹ ⁸⁴² ⁸⁴³ ⁸⁴⁴ ⁸⁴⁵ ⁸⁴⁶ ⁸⁴⁷ ⁸⁴⁸ ⁸⁴⁹ ⁸⁵⁰ ⁸⁵¹ ⁸⁵² ⁸⁵³ ⁸⁵⁴ ⁸⁵⁵ ⁸⁵⁶ ⁸⁵⁷ ⁸⁵⁸ ⁸⁵⁹ ⁸⁶⁰ ⁸⁶¹ ⁸⁶² ⁸⁶³ ⁸⁶⁴ ⁸⁶⁵ ⁸⁶⁶ ⁸⁶⁷ ⁸⁶⁸ ⁸⁶⁹ ⁸⁷⁰ ⁸⁷¹ ⁸⁷² ⁸⁷³ ⁸⁷⁴ ⁸⁷⁵ ⁸⁷⁶ ⁸⁷⁷ ⁸⁷⁸ ⁸⁷⁹ ⁸⁸⁰ ⁸⁸¹ ⁸⁸² ⁸⁸³ ⁸⁸⁴ ⁸⁸⁵ ⁸⁸⁶ ⁸⁸⁷ ⁸⁸⁸ ⁸⁸⁹ ⁸⁹⁰ ⁸⁹¹ ⁸⁹² ⁸⁹³ ⁸⁹⁴ ⁸⁹⁵ ⁸⁹⁶ ⁸⁹⁷ ⁸⁹⁸ ⁸⁹⁹ ⁹⁰⁰ ⁹⁰¹ ⁹⁰² ⁹⁰³ ⁹⁰⁴ ⁹⁰⁵ ⁹⁰⁶ ⁹⁰⁷ ⁹⁰⁸ ⁹⁰⁹ ⁹¹⁰ ⁹¹¹ ⁹¹² ⁹¹³ ⁹¹⁴ ⁹¹⁵ ⁹¹⁶ ⁹¹⁷ ⁹¹⁸ ⁹¹⁹ ⁹²⁰ ⁹²¹ ⁹²² ⁹²³ ⁹²⁴ ⁹²⁵ ⁹²⁶ ⁹²⁷ ⁹²⁸ ⁹²⁹ ⁹³⁰ ⁹³¹ ⁹³² ⁹³³ ⁹³⁴ ⁹³⁵ ⁹³⁶ ⁹³⁷ ⁹³⁸ ⁹³⁹ ⁹⁴⁰ ⁹⁴¹ ⁹⁴² ⁹⁴³ ⁹⁴⁴ ⁹⁴⁵ ⁹⁴⁶ ⁹⁴⁷ ⁹⁴⁸ ⁹⁴⁹ ⁹⁵⁰ ⁹⁵¹ ⁹⁵² ⁹⁵³ ⁹⁵⁴ ⁹⁵⁵ ⁹⁵⁶ ⁹⁵⁷ ⁹⁵⁸ ⁹⁵⁹ ⁹⁶⁰ ⁹⁶¹ ⁹⁶² ⁹⁶³ ⁹⁶⁴ ⁹⁶⁵ ⁹⁶⁶ ⁹⁶⁷ ⁹⁶⁸ ⁹⁶⁹ ⁹⁷⁰ ⁹⁷¹ ⁹⁷² ⁹⁷³ ⁹⁷⁴ ⁹⁷⁵ ⁹⁷⁶ ⁹⁷⁷ ⁹⁷⁸ ⁹⁷⁹ ⁹⁸⁰ ⁹⁸¹ ⁹⁸² ⁹⁸³ ⁹⁸⁴ ⁹⁸⁵ ⁹⁸⁶ ⁹⁸⁷ ⁹⁸⁸ ⁹⁸⁹ ⁹⁹⁰ ⁹⁹¹ ⁹⁹² ⁹⁹³ ⁹⁹⁴ ⁹⁹⁵ ⁹⁹⁶ ⁹⁹⁷ ⁹⁹⁸ ⁹⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰⁰ ¹⁰⁰¹ ¹⁰⁰² ¹⁰⁰³ ¹⁰⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁰⁷ ¹⁰⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁰⁹ ¹⁰¹⁰ ¹⁰¹¹ ¹⁰¹² ¹⁰¹³ ¹⁰¹⁴ ¹⁰¹⁵ ¹⁰¹⁶ ¹⁰¹⁷ ¹⁰¹⁸ ¹⁰¹⁹ ¹⁰²⁰ ¹⁰²¹ ¹⁰²² ¹⁰²³ ¹⁰²⁴ ¹⁰²⁵ ¹⁰²⁶ ¹⁰²⁷ ¹⁰²⁸ ¹⁰²⁹ ¹⁰³⁰ ¹⁰³¹ ¹⁰³² ¹⁰³³ ¹⁰³⁴ ¹⁰³⁵ ¹⁰³⁶ ¹⁰³⁷ ¹⁰³⁸ ¹⁰³⁹ ¹⁰⁴⁰ ¹⁰⁴¹ ¹⁰⁴² ¹⁰⁴³ ¹⁰⁴⁴ ¹⁰⁴⁵ ¹⁰⁴⁶ ¹⁰⁴⁷ ¹⁰⁴⁸ ¹⁰⁴⁹ ¹⁰⁵⁰ ¹⁰⁵¹ ¹⁰⁵² ¹⁰⁵³ ¹⁰⁵⁴ ¹⁰⁵⁵ ¹⁰⁵⁶ ¹⁰⁵⁷ ¹⁰⁵⁸ ¹⁰⁵⁹ ¹⁰⁶⁰ ¹⁰⁶¹ ¹⁰⁶² ¹⁰⁶³ ¹⁰⁶⁴ ¹⁰⁶⁵ ¹⁰⁶⁶ ¹⁰⁶⁷ ¹⁰⁶⁸ ¹⁰⁶⁹ ¹⁰⁷⁰ ¹⁰⁷¹ ¹⁰⁷² ¹⁰⁷³ ¹⁰⁷⁴ ¹⁰⁷⁵ ¹⁰⁷⁶ ¹⁰⁷⁷ ¹⁰⁷⁸ ¹⁰⁷⁹ ¹⁰⁸⁰ ¹⁰⁸¹ ¹⁰⁸² ¹⁰⁸³ ¹⁰⁸⁴ ¹⁰⁸⁵ ¹⁰⁸⁶ ¹⁰⁸⁷ ¹⁰⁸⁸ ¹⁰⁸⁹ ¹⁰⁹⁰ ¹⁰⁹¹ ¹⁰⁹² ¹⁰⁹³ ¹⁰⁹⁴ ¹⁰⁹⁵ ¹⁰⁹⁶ ¹⁰⁹⁷ ¹⁰⁹⁸ ¹⁰⁹⁹ ¹¹⁰⁰ ¹¹⁰¹ ¹¹⁰² ¹¹⁰³ ¹¹⁰⁴ ¹¹⁰⁵ ¹¹⁰⁶ ¹¹⁰⁷ ¹¹⁰⁸ ¹¹⁰⁹ ¹¹¹⁰ ¹¹¹¹ ¹¹¹² ¹¹¹³ ¹¹¹⁴ ¹¹¹⁵ ¹¹¹⁶ ¹¹¹⁷ ¹¹¹⁸ ¹¹¹⁹ ¹¹²⁰ ¹¹²¹ ¹¹²² ¹¹²³ ¹¹²⁴ ¹¹²⁵ ¹¹²⁶ ¹¹²⁷ ¹¹²⁸ ¹¹²⁹ ¹¹³⁰ ¹¹³¹ ¹¹³² ¹¹³³ ¹¹³⁴ ¹¹³⁵ ¹¹³⁶ ¹¹³⁷ ¹¹³⁸ ¹¹³⁹ ¹¹⁴⁰ ¹¹⁴¹ ¹¹⁴² ¹¹⁴³ ¹¹⁴⁴ ¹¹⁴⁵ ¹¹⁴⁶ ¹¹⁴⁷ ¹¹⁴⁸ ¹¹⁴⁹ ¹¹⁵⁰ ¹¹⁵¹ ¹¹⁵² ¹¹⁵³ ¹¹⁵⁴ ¹¹⁵⁵ ¹¹⁵⁶ ¹¹⁵⁷ ¹¹⁵⁸ ¹¹⁵⁹ ¹¹⁶⁰ ¹¹⁶¹ ¹¹⁶² ¹¹⁶³ ¹¹⁶⁴ ¹¹⁶⁵ ¹¹⁶⁶ ¹¹⁶⁷ ¹¹⁶⁸ ¹¹⁶⁹ ¹¹⁷⁰ ¹¹⁷¹ ¹¹⁷² ¹¹⁷³ ¹¹⁷⁴ ¹¹⁷⁵ ¹¹⁷⁶ ¹¹⁷⁷ ¹¹⁷⁸ ¹¹⁷⁹ ¹¹⁸⁰ ¹¹⁸¹ ¹¹⁸² ¹¹⁸³ ¹¹⁸⁴ ¹¹⁸⁵ ¹¹⁸⁶ ¹¹⁸⁷ ¹¹⁸⁸ ¹¹⁸⁹ ¹¹⁹⁰ ¹¹⁹¹ ¹¹⁹² ¹¹⁹³ ¹¹⁹⁴ ¹¹⁹⁵ ¹¹⁹⁶ ¹¹⁹⁷ ¹¹⁹⁸ ¹¹⁹⁹ ¹²⁰⁰ ¹²⁰¹ ¹²⁰² ¹²⁰³ ¹²⁰⁴ ¹²⁰⁵ ¹²⁰⁶ ¹²⁰⁷ ¹²⁰⁸ ¹²⁰⁹ ¹²¹⁰ ¹²¹¹ ¹²¹² ¹²¹³ ¹²¹⁴ ¹²¹⁵ ¹²¹⁶ ¹²¹⁷ ¹²¹⁸ ¹²¹⁹ ¹²²⁰ ¹²²¹ ¹²²² ¹²²³ ¹²²⁴ ¹²²⁵ ¹²²⁶ ¹²²⁷ ¹²²⁸ ¹²²⁹ ¹²³⁰ ¹²³¹ ¹²³² ¹²³³ ¹²³⁴ ¹²³⁵ ¹²³⁶ ¹²³⁷ ¹²³⁸ ¹²³⁹ ¹²⁴⁰ ¹²⁴¹ ¹²⁴² ¹²⁴³ ¹²⁴⁴ ¹²⁴⁵ ¹²⁴⁶ ¹²⁴⁷ ¹²⁴⁸ ¹²⁴⁹ ¹²⁵⁰ ¹²⁵¹ ¹²⁵² ¹²⁵³ ¹²⁵⁴ ¹²⁵⁵ ¹²⁵⁶ ¹²⁵⁷ ¹²⁵⁸ ¹²⁵⁹ ¹²⁶⁰ ¹²⁶¹ ¹²⁶² ¹²⁶³ ¹²⁶⁴ ¹²⁶⁵ ¹²⁶⁶ ¹²⁶⁷ ¹²⁶⁸ ¹²⁶⁹ ¹²⁷⁰ ¹²⁷¹ ¹²⁷² ¹²⁷³ ¹²⁷⁴ ¹²⁷⁵ ¹²⁷⁶ ¹²⁷⁷ ¹²⁷⁸ ¹²⁷⁹ ¹²⁸⁰ ¹²⁸¹ ¹²⁸² ¹²⁸³ ¹²⁸⁴ ¹²⁸⁵ ¹²⁸⁶ ¹²⁸⁷ ¹²⁸⁸ ¹²⁸⁹ ¹²⁹⁰ ¹²⁹¹ ¹²⁹² ¹²⁹³ ¹²⁹⁴ ¹²⁹⁵ ¹²⁹⁶ ¹²⁹⁷ ¹²⁹⁸ ¹²⁹⁹ ¹³⁰⁰ ¹³⁰¹ ¹³⁰² ¹³⁰³ ¹³⁰⁴ ¹³⁰⁵ ¹³⁰⁶ ¹³⁰⁷ ¹³⁰⁸ ¹³⁰⁹ ¹³¹⁰ ¹³¹¹ ¹³¹² ¹³¹³ ¹³¹⁴ ¹³¹⁵ ¹³¹⁶ ¹³¹⁷ ¹³¹⁸ ¹³¹⁹ ¹³²⁰ ¹³²¹ ¹³²² ¹³²³ ¹³²⁴ ¹³²⁵ ¹³²⁶ ¹³²⁷ ¹³²⁸ ¹³²⁹

τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι ἦτε δούλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ὑπακούσατε δέ etc. (for which
 ὄντες ποτὲ δούλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὑπακούσατε ἐκ καρδίας might have
 585 been used),¹ Luke xxiv. 18 σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἱερουσαλ. καὶ οὐκ
 7th ed. ἔγνων, where, in a language to which the participial construction
 is peculiarly congenial, it would have been more correct to say :
 σὺ μόνος παροικῶν Ἱερ. οὐκ ἔγνων, Matt. xi. 25 probably also 1 Cor.
 iv. 4. See Fr. Mt. pp. 287, 413 ; Gesen. on Isa. v. 4. Cf. with
 this, what Bttm. § 136, 1 has remarked on clauses connected by
 μέν and δέ ; and as to parataxis in general, Kühner II. 415 f. In
 some of these passages, however, the former construction may
 have been adopted with the design of giving to the first clause its
 full prominence. This becomes still more apparent from Jno. iii. 19
 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ κρίσις, ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν
 οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος etc., see BCrus. and in particular
 Lücke in loc., cf. also vi. 50. Thus also John in vii. 4 οὐδεὶς τι ἐν
 κρυπτῷ ποιεῖ καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι prefers to com-
 bine in parallelism the two irreconcilable acts (nobody does both
 at the same time), than to write οὐδεὶς . . . ποιεῖ ζητῶν αὐτός etc.
 On Matt. xviii. 21 see above, § 45, note 2 p. 355. But in
 1 Pet. iv. 6 the two clauses dependent on ἵνα are to be regarded
 as co-ordinate ; only in this connection κρῖνεσθαι must be under-
 stood correctly.

555 Corresponding to this idiom, only more limited, would be the figure of
 6th ed. speech ἐν διὰ δυοῖν (hendiadys), by which instead of *one* substantive with
 an adjective or Genitive (of quality) *two* substantives are used, the quality
 of the thing being thus for the sake of emphasis raised to a grammatical
 equality with the thing itself: pateris libamus et auro, i.e. pateris aureis.
 This is substantially an appositive relation: pateris et quidem auro, pat.
 h. e. auro, see Fr. exc. 4 ad Mt. ; Teipel in the Archiv f. d. Stud. d. neuern
 Sprachen 10 Bd. 1 Heft. For a more exact view of the subject, see
 C. F. Müller in Schneidewin, Philol. VII. 297 ff. Expositors have in fact
 asserted the existence of this figure in the N. T. (Glass. philol. sacra I.
 18 sq.), and some of them in the most unmeasured and injudicious terms
 (Heinrichs), e.g. Matt. iii. 11 ; Acts xiv. 13 ; Jno. i. 14 ; iii. 5 ; Heb. vi. 10.
 But even a sifted collection of examples (Wilke, Rhet. S. 149) does not
 furnish one that is unquestionable. Either the two notions connected
 together are really distinct, as in 2 Tim. iv. 1 ; 2 Pet. i. 16 ; or the second

¹ Others, as finally Fr. also, lay the stress on the Preterite ἦτε, *that ye were* (that this is past) ; and this exposition may urge the position of ἦτε in its favor. But on this interpretation Paul would at any rate have expressed himself somewhat artificially, since ἦτε primarily designates their state only as having formerly existed, not from the present point of view as terminated, (*ye were servants, not ye have been*).

substantive is epexegetical (consequently, supplementary), as in (Rom. 653 i. 5) Acts i. 25; xxiii. 6; Eph. vi. 18, cf. also 2 Cor. viii. 4 (*καὶ and indeed, namely* p. 437 c.), — a construction which, even though of the same genus with hendiadys, is of a different species. (Interpreters have wholly erred in wanting to find a hendiadys in the verb also, e.g. Phil. iv. 18.)

§ 67. ABNORMAL RELATION OF INDIVIDUAL WORDS IN A SENTENCE (HYPALLAGE). 586
7th ed.

1. Occasionally an irregularity may be noticed in the relation of individual words in a sentence. This occurs sometimes as *constructio ad sensum* (very frequent in Greek authors), — an irregularity which, to the reader who attentively observes the connection, cannot render the meaning either difficult or doubtful; at other times it may be characterized as an inadvertence on the part of the writer, who, busied with his thoughts, disregards accuracy of expression.

We notice;

a. The *constructio ad sensum* (πρὸς τὸ σημαίνόμενον or κατὰ σύνεσιν), examples of which have already been adduced in connection with the predicate and attributive § 58, and in connection with the pronouns § 21 (cf. also Rev. iii. 4).

b. The subject is omitted, and has to be *indirectly* supplied from the preceding context: 1 Cor. vii. 36 γαμείτωσαν viz. the two young persons who have associated together; as inferred from the preceding mention of a marriageable daughter. In Gal. i. 23 μόνον ἀκούοντες ἦσαν the notion of church *members* is to be gathered from ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις vs. 22 (cf. Caes. gall. 4, 14). There would be a similar instance in 1 Tim. ii. 15, if in ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει the word τέκνα were to be supplied from τεκνογονίας preceding. This is grammatically admissible, cf. Plat. legg. 10 p. 886 d., where γενόμενοι is referred to θεογονίαν, as if the expression θεῶν γένεσις had been employed, see Zell, Aristot. ethic. p. 209; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 29, 160; Küster (Reisig) Xen. Oecon. p. 247 sq., yet see above, § 58, 4 p. 516. In 1 Tim. v. 4 probably 556 for μανθανέτωσαν the subject χῆραι is to be deduced from the collective τις χήρα, see Huther in loc., as a Plur. often refers to 654 τις (Rev. xiv. 11), see Herbst, Xen. mem. p. 50. On the other hand, in Rom. xiii. 6 λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν refers to οἱ ἄρχοντες vs. 3.

c. Sometimes there is a sudden change of subject: Jno. xix. 4 f. ἐξήλθεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Πιλάτος καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς. Ἴδε ἄγω ὑμῖν

αὐτὸν ἔξω . . . ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω . . . καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς νῖζ. Pilate, cf. xix. 38 ; Luke xix. 4 προδραμῶν . . . ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομορέαν (Ζακχαῖος), ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτόν (Ἰησοῦν), ὅτι ἐκείνης ἡμέλλε (Ἰησοῦς) διέρχεσθαι, cf. xiv. 5 ; xv. 15 ; xvii. 2 ; Mark ix. 20 ; Acts vi. 6 ; x. 4 ; Rom. x. 14 f. ; Judith v. 8. On 1 Jno. v. 16, see § 58, 9 p. 523. In Greek prose authors this transition from one subject to another is not uncommon : Her. 6, 30 ὁ δὲ (Histiaeus) οὐτ' ἂν ἔπαθε κακὸν οὐδέν, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἀπήκέ (Darius) τ' ἂν αὐτῷ τὴν αἰτίην, Demosth. c. Phorm. p. 587 a. ὃς οὐκ ἔφασκεν οὔτε τὰ χρήματα ἐντεθεῖσθαι τοῦτον (Phormion), οὔτε τὸ χρυσίον ἀπειληφέναι (Lampis), 587 Plutarch. Poplic. compar. 5 . . . προσέλαβεν (Poplicola) ὅσα δόντα 7th ed. ἀγαπητὸν ἦν νικῆσαι· καὶ γὰρ τὸν πόλεμον διέλυσε (Porsena) etc., vit. Lysand. 24 ἄλλο δ' οὐδέν ἐχρήσατο (Agesil.) αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον· ἀλλὰ τοῦ Χρόνου διελθόντος ἀπέπλευσεν (Lysand.) εἰς τὴν Σπάρτην etc., Ages. 40 τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀρχίδαμος . . . παρέλαβε, καὶ (sc. αὐτῇ) διέμεινε τῷ γένει, Artax. 15 τοῦ κροτάφου τυχῶν κατέβαλον τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τέθνηκεν (οὗτος) etc., Lysias caed. Eratosth. 10 ἵνα τὸν τιτθὴν αὐτῷ (παιδίῳ) διδῷ καὶ μὴ βοᾷ (τὸ παιδ.). Cf. Poppo, observ. in Thuc. p. 189 ; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 214 and Plutarch. IV. 281, 331 ; V. 86, 295 ; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. 215 ; Maetzner, Antiphon 145 ; Schoem. Is. 294. As to Hebrew usage, see Gesen. Lgb. 803.

d. Words referring to something antecedent are used in a loose reference. On αὐτός see § 22, 3 p. 145 sq. So in Gal. ii. 2 αὐτοῖς refers to Ἱεροσόλυμα vs. 1, but the inhabitants are meant. Similarly in Acts xvii. 16 ; 2 Pet. iii. 4 αὐτοῦ is to be understood of Christ, who has not been expressly named, but is intimated in παρουσία. In Jno. xv. 6 αὐτά refers to the Sing. τὸ κλῆμα, which is in apposition to εἷ τις. In Acts iv. 7 αὐτούς, in a different way, refers, not to αὐτῶν vs. 5, but to vss. 1 and 2. In Acts x. 7 αὐτῷ refers, not to Simon vs. 6, but to Cornelius vss. 1–5, as is indicated even by some MSS., which read τῷ Κορινθίῳ, a manifest gloss. In Acts vii. 24 πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, no Egyptian had been previously mentioned ; the ἀδικῶν is merely hinted in ἀδικούμενον, and that he was an Egyptian is assumed as known from the connection. Lastly, in 2 Jno. 7 οὗτος refers to πολλοὶ πλάνοι, and sums up in one person the plurality. Vice versa, in 1 Jno. iv. 4 αὐτοῖς refers to ἀντιχρίστου vs. 3. The reference of αὐτοῦ in Jno. 655 xx. 7, of αὐτόν vs. 15, and of ἐκείνοι Jno. vii. 45 to the nearest subject, is more simple, see p. 157. It is an inaccuracy of construction also when a pronoun, especially a relative, serves in a

single form for two cases 1 Cor. ii. 9 ἃ ὁφθαλμοῖς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρ. οὐκ ἀνέβη Sept. Fundamentally this falls under the class of constructions treated of in § 64, I. 1 p. 581 sqq. The like occurs frequently in Latin also, Kritz, Sallust. I. p. 67 ; II. p. 295 sq.

e. Of two parallel members of a sentence, the first is sometimes expressed in such terms as to appear to comprehend the second, though from the nature of the case that is impossible: Acts xxvii. 22 ἀποβολὴ 557 ψυχῆς οὐδεμία ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου would literally mean: *there shall be no loss of life except of the ship*; instead of which should have been said: there shall be no loss of life, only loss of the ship. Similar is Gal. i. 19 ἔτερον τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, if, with Fr. Matt. p. 482, we choose to render it: *alium apostolum non vidi, sed vidi Jacobum* etc., that is, so that it would be necessary 588 merely to repeat εἶδον with Ἰάκ.; yet see my Comment. and Mey. in loc.¹ 7th ed. Nearly the same use of εἰ μὴ occurs in Rev. xxi. 27 οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ . . . πάν κοινὸν καὶ ὁ ποῶν βδέλυγμα . . . εἰ μὴ οἱ γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς, where the γεγραμμένοι are not to be counted under πάν κοινόν. The meaning is rather: *nothing profane shall enter; only they who are written* etc. *shall enter*, ix. 4. Cf. 1 Kings iii. 18 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐθεὶς μεθ' ἡμῶν παρὲς ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ.

2. The very structure of the sentence has been disturbed by the inadvertence of the writer in Luke xxiv. 27 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διηρμήνευεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ. Here it can hardly be assumed that to Moses and the prophets are opposed certain other books of the O. T. to which Jesus passed, nor, with Kühnöl, that Jesus first quoted the statements of the prophets, then, as a separate proceeding, began to interpret them (see van Hengel, annot. p. 104); but probably Luke meant to say: Jesus, beginning *from (with)* Moses, went through *all the prophets*; see also BCrus. in loc. Instead of this, having ἀπό in mind, he annexes πάντες προφηταὶ in the Genitive. Meyer's device is unsatisfactory. In connection with this passage may be taken Acts iii. 24 πάντες οἱ προφηταὶ ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν etc. Luke might have said, *all the prophets, Samuel (as the first) and all his successors (in order) etc.*, or, *all the prophets from Samuel downwards, as many of them etc.* As the words now stand, they

¹ In Heb. xii. 25 εἰ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον . . . πολλὸ μάλλον ἡμεῖς etc. those who (Kühnöl also) render πολλὸ μάλλον by multo minus repeat for the apodosis ἐκφευγόμεθα alone. But the phrase retains its signification multo magis, and the entire negative notion οὐκ ἐκφευγ. is to be repeated after it. Cf. Caes. gall. 1, 47.

656 contain an unmistakable tautology. For even the division, proposed by Casaubon and adopted by a host of expositors (including Valckenaer), τῶν καθ. ὅσοι ἐλάλ. does not help the passage essentially. Still we have *all the prophets from Samuel on*, and then, as if not already included in the foregoing, *the whole succession that followed Samuel and prophesied*. The expedient that van Hengel (as above, p. 103) suggests, supplying ἕως Ἰωάννου
 558 (Matt. xi. 13), is arbitrary, and gives only the equally inappropriate sense: *from Samuel and the succeeding prophets . . . to John*,
 6th ed. whilst it was to be expected that two boundaries of this series would be mentioned. Hengel thus gains at last merely Luke's brachylogy (already explained p. 621): ἀρχεσθαι ἀπὸ . . . ἕως.

3. Formerly critics went much farther in discovering such inaccuracies resulting from inadvertence. Namely,

a. A false reference of the attributive to the substantive, affecting
 589 the grammatical form of the former, was thought to exist not
 7th ed. only in Acts v. 20 τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης (for ταῦτα), Rom. vii. 24 see above, p. 237 sq., but also (Bengel on Luke xxii. 20; Bauer, Philol. Thucyd. Paul. p. 263) Eph. ii. 2 κατὰ τὸν ἀρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ αἵρος, τοῦ πνεύματος etc. instead of τὸ πνεῦμα, iii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 7; Luke viii. 32; xxii. 20; and this supposed species of hypallage¹ was supported by examples from ancient authors. In a sentence of some length, containing a variety of relations, such inaccuracy, especially on the part of an unpractised writer, would be quite possible. In the poets also passages might be pointed out, which without some such assumption admit of only a forced interpretation, cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 73 sq.; Hm. Vig. 891 and Soph. Philoct. p. 202 and Eurip. Hel. p. 7; Krüger, grammat. Untersuch. III. 37 f. But in prose such instances are extremely rare (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 161; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 206; Heinichen, Euseb. II. 175); in the N. T. there is not a single one that is unquestionable; see F. Woken, pietas crit. in hypallagas bibl. Viteb. 1718. 8vo. Luke viii. 32 disposes of itself. As to Eph. iii. 2, see my Progr. de Hypallage et Hendiadyi in N. T. libris. Erlang. 1824. 4to. p. 15 and Harless in loc. In Eph. ii. 2, where the apostle might most easily have strayed from the correct construction, πνεῦμα is that spirit which pervades and rules men of the world, and of which Satan is regarded as the lord and master, see Mey. in loc. Heinichen, Euseb. II. 99, insists on the

¹ Cf. *Gloss. philol. sacr.* I. 652 sqq.; Jani, *ars poet. lat.* p. 258 sqq. On the other hand, cf. *Elster, de Hypallage.* Helmst. 1845. 4to.

existence of hypallage. In 2 Cor. iii. 7 εἰ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου 657
 ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη ἐν λίθοις, Paul might in contrast
 with διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος have said with greater simplicity : ἡ
 διακονία τοῦ γράμματος ἐντετυπωμένου ἐν λίθοις. But the present
 connection of the words is not incorrect. Moses' ministry of
 death was in so far itself ἐν λίθοις ἐντετυπωμένη, as it consisted in
 communicating laws threatening and inflicting death, and in
 administering them among the people. The letter of the law
 contained the ministry which Moses had to execute. Moreover,
 there is a grammatical resemblance between this passage and Tac.
 annal. 14, 16 quod species ipsa carminum docet, non impetu et
 instinctis nec ore uno fluens. In Heb. ix. 10 ἐπικείμενα is certainly
 not construed with δικαιώμασι instead of ἐπικείμενοις, but δικαι-
 ώμασι is in apposition to ἐπὶ βρώμασιν etc., and ἐπικείμενα cor-
 responds to μὴ δυνάμεναι, the neuter being selected because both,
 δῶρα καὶ θυσίαι, are here included. According to the other
 reading, δικαιώματα, which is well supported [by Cod. Sin. also], 559
 ἐπικείμενα can be referred to that appositive word quite regularly. 661 d.
 There is more appearance of irregular reference in Luke xxii. 20,
 where τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον might have been construed with
 ἐν τῷ αἵματι. But it is not probable that in so short a sentence 590
 Luke should have employed ἐκχυνόμενον from inadvertence. It is 7th ed.
 more likely that, as he had connected διδόμενον with σῶμα, he
 joined ἐκχυν. to ποτήριον, meaning the contents of the cup, and
 this metonymy is easier still than the other, τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ
 διαθήκη. This anomaly is obviously not of a grammatical, but of
 a logical kind, (although to pour out a cup may be said with entire
 correctness). Yet Schulthess (on the Lord's Supper, S. 155 f.)
 need not have grown so warm over the matter. In Heb. vi. 1
 even Kühnöl has rejected the hypallage, alleged by Palaiet and
 others. On Jno. i. 14 πλήρης χάριτος etc. see § 62, 3 p. 564,
 and on 2 Cor. xi. 28 and Rev. i. 5, § 59, 8 pp. 532, 533. In 2 Cor.
 iv. 17 αἰώνιον βῆρος δόξης cannot be taken for αἰωνίου βαρ. δόξης,
 for the reason that this would destroy the harmonious arrangement
 at which the apostle manifestly aimed (παραντίκα, αἰώνιον, ἐλαφρόν,
 βῆρος, θλίψις, δόξα). On 1 Cor. iv. 3 see Meyer against Billroth
 and Rückert. In Acts xi. 5 εἶδον καταβαίνων σκευός τι, ὡς ὀθόνην
 μεγάλην, τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς καθιεμένην etc. must not be regarded
 as an hypallage, on being compared with x. 11 (καθιεμένον) ; the
 participles may be referred with equal propriety to σκευός or to
 ὀθόνη. It is difficult to decide on 2 Cor. xii. 21 μή . . . πενήθσω

πολλοὺς τῶν προσημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντων etc. We naturally ask, why not *all* impenitent sinners? Did Paul intend to say: τοὺς μὴ μετανοήσαντας? As, however, in vs. 21 a different class of sins is named from that in vs. 20, we may, with Mey., conclude that the προσημαρτηκότες are more closely characterized by μὴ μετανοήσαντ. as those that have remained impenitent only in reference to sins of sensuality, mentioned immediately after.

b. Akin to hypallage is antiptosis, which some (including Kühnöl) find in Heb. ix. 2 πρόθεσις ἄρτων, as if for ἄρτοι προθέσεως (cf. as to this remarkable figure Hm. Vig. p. 890; Soph. Electr. p. 8; Blomfield, Aeschyl. Agamemn. 148, 1360; Wyttenb. Plat. Phaed. p. 232), nearly as the following passages have been understood: Plotin. Enn. 2, 1 p. 97 g. πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τοῦ ἀποτελέσματος ὑπάρχειν προσήκει for πρὸς τὸ τοῦ βουλήματος ἀποτελεσμα, or Thuc. 1, 6 οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν εὐδαιμόνων for οἱ εὐδαίμονες τῶν πρεσβ. (see Scholiasts). But that N. T. passage is to be rendered quite simply: *the exposition of loaves* (the sacred usage of laying out loaves). Valcken. even wants to take ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθ. ἄρτ. for ἡ τράπ. τῶν ἄρτων τῆς προθ. Lastly, it is altogether wrong to take, as do some (including Bengel), διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης in Rom. ix. 31 for δικαιοσύνην νόμου, see Fr. in loc. In reference to other alleged incongruities of this description, cf. the instructive 1st Exc. of Fr. on Mark, p. 759 sqq.

560 § 68. REGARD TO SOUND IN THE STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES;
6th ed. PARONOMASIA AND PLAY UPON WORDS (ANNOMINATIO), PAR-
591 ALLELISM, VERSE.
7th ed.

1. The general euphony of the N. T. style (in which cacophony but rarely appears, 1 Cor. xii. 2, cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 105 and paralip. p. 53 sq.) was not for the most part the result of design. Only, in regard to paronomasia and annominatio, many instances may have been intentional. Paronomasia,¹ which as is well known consists in the combination of words of similar sound, and is one of the favorite fancies of Oriental writers,² is peculiarly frequent in the Epistles of Paul, partly, it should seem, accidentally, and partly studied by the writer in his desire to impart genial liveliness

¹ See Glassii philol. sacr. I. 1335-1342; Ch. B. Michaelis, de paronomas. sacra. Hal. 1737. 4to., also Lob. paralip. 501 sqq. A solid and exhaustive monograph is J. F. Böttcher's de paronomasia finitimisque ei figuris Paulo Ap. frequentatis. Lips. 1823. 8vo.

² See Verschuir, dissertat. philol. exeg. p. 172 sqq.

to the expression, or greater emphasis to the thought; as, Luke xxi. 11 καὶ λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται (cf. the German *Hunger und Kummer*), Hesiod. opp. 226; Plutarch. Coriol. c. 13, see Valcken. in loc.; Acts xvii. 25 ζῶν καὶ πνoήν (cf. the German *leben und weben, Hülle und Fülle, Saus und Braus, rädern und ädern*, Varr. R. R. 3, 2, 13 utrum propter oves, an propter aves, see Baiter, Isocr. Paneg. p. 117); Heb. v. 8 ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν (seine Leiden leiteten ihn zum Gehorsam, cf. Her. 1, 207), see Wetst. and Valcken. in loc.; Rom. xi. 17 τινὲς τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν. Thus, in a series of words, the paronomastic are placed next to each other, as in Rom. i. 29, 31 (πορνεία, πονηρία) φθόνου, φόβου . . . ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους (Wetst. in loc.). In other passages words of similar derivation are placed together; as, 1 Cor. ii. 13 ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες, 2 Cor. viii. 22 ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις σπουδαῖον, ix. 8 ἐν παντὶ πάντοτε πᾶσαν αὐτάρκειαν, Acts xxiv. 3; 2 Cor. x. 12 αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς μετροῦντες, Rom. viii. 23 αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν, Phil. i. 4 (Xen. mem. 3, 12, 6 δυσκολία καὶ μανία πολλάκις πολλοῖς . . . ἐμπίπτουσιν, 4, 4, 4 πολλῶν πολλάκις ὑπὸ τῶν δικαστῶν ἀφιεμένων, An. 2, 4, 10 αὐτοὶ ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ἐχώρου, 2, 5, 7 πάντῃ γὰρ πάντα τοῖς θεοῖς ὑποχα καὶ πανταχῇ πάντων ἴσον οἱ θεοὶ κρατοῦσι, Polyb. 6, 18, 6; Athen. 8, 352; Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 22; Synes. prov. 2, p. 116 b. πάντα πανταχοῦ πάντων κακῶν ἔμπλεα ἦν, see Krü. Xen. An. 1, 9, 2; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 138, 380; Boisson. Nicet. 243; Beier, Cic. off. 592 I. 128; Jahn, Archiv II. 402). Matt. xxi. 41 κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτοὺς *he will miserably destroy those miserable fellows* (Demosth. Mid. 413 b. εἰτα θανμάξεις, εἰ κακὸς κακῶς ἀπολῇ, adv. Zenoth. 575 c.; Aristophan. Plut. 65, 418; Diog. L. 2, 76; Alciplhr. 3, 10; cf. also Aeschyl. Pers. 1041; Plaut. Aulular. 1, 1, 3 sq. and Schaef. Soph. Electr. 742; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 471 and 561 paralip. 8, 56 sqq.; Foertsch, de locis Lysiae p. 44).¹

Writers occasionally use strange or uncommon words, or forms, for the purpose of producing a paronomasia (Gesenius LG. S. 858) e.g. Gal. v. 7 πείθεσθαι . . . ἡ πεισμονή (see my Comment. in loc.), cf. die Bisthümer sind verwandelt in Wüstthümer, die Abteien

¹ See also Doederlein, Progr. de brachylogia p. 8 sq. Especially a large collection of such paronomastic combinations will be found in E. A. Diller, Progr. de consensu notionum qualis est in vocibus ejusd. originis diversitate formarum copulatis. Misen. 1842. 4to.

660 sind nun — Raubteien (Schiller in Wallenstein's Lager), Verbesserungen nicht Verböserungen.¹

2. Annominatio is akin to paronomasia, but differs from it in this: that it adds to a regard for the sound of words, a regard to their meaning also (as, in German: Träume sind Schäume); consequently for the most part it consists of antitheses, e.g. Matt. xvi. 18 σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω etc., Rom. v. 19 ὥσπερ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτω καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται, i. 20 τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ . . . καθορᾶται, Phil. iii. 2 f. βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν, ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή (Diog. L. 6, 24 τὴν Εὐκλείδου σχολὴν ἔλεγε χολήν, τὴν δὲ Πλάτωνος διατριβὴν κατατριβήν), iii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 8 ἀπορούμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξυπορούμενοι, 2 Thess. iii. 11 μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους (cf. Seidler, Eurip. Troad. p. 11), 2 Cor. v. 4 ἐφ' ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι, Acts viii. 30 ἀρά γε γινώσκεις, ἀ ἀναγινώσκεις; Jno. ii. 23 f. πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ . . . αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς, Rom. i. 28; iii. 8; xi. 17; xii. 8; xvi. 2; Eph. i. 23; iii. 14, 19; Gal. iv. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 17; vi. 2; xi. 29, 31; xiv. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 2; v. 21; x. 3; 1 Tim. i. 8 f.; 2 Tim. iii. 4; iv. 7; 3 Jno. 7 f.; Rev. xxii. 18 f. [Matt. vi. 16]. In Philem. 20 the allusion in *ὀναίμην* to the name of the slave

593 *Ὀνήσιμος*² is less obvious. Moreover, the same remark made
 7th ed. above respecting strange words may be repeated here, and is per-
 562 haps applicable to Gal. v. 12; cf. my Comment. in loc., and also
 6th ed.

¹ In the Agenda of Duke Henry of Saxony, 1539, it is said in the preface respecting the Popish parson: sein Sorge ist nicht *Seelsorge*, sondern *Meelsorge*.

² An annominatio in which regard is had *solely* to the meaning occurs in Philem. 11 Ὀνήσιμον τὸν ποτὶ σοὶ ἄχρηστον, νυνὶ δὲ σοὶ καὶ ἐμὸι εὐχρηστον etc. Still more latent would be the annominatio in 1 Cor. i. 23: κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἰσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίους μὲν σκάνδαλον, Ἰθνησι δὲ μωρίαν, ἀπτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς . . . σοφίαν, where Paul is said to have had in view the words *ܠܗܝܬܐ* chald. *crux*, *ܠܝܫܬܐ* *σκάνδαλον*, *ܠܚܝܬܐ* *stultus*, and *ܠܚܝܬܐ* *sapientia* (Glassii philol. I. 1339). I am not aware, however, of such a word as *ܠܗܝܬܐ* in Chaldaic; and it is only in Aethiopic that *ܠܗܝܬܐ* signifies *cross*. The whole statement is an instance of learned trifling. Equally improbable is Jerome's conjecture on Gal. i. 6, that in *μετατίθεσθε* the apostle makes an allusion to the Oriental etymology of the name *Γαλάται* (from *ܡܠܝܬܐ* or *ܡܠܝܬܐ*), see my Comment. in loc. and *Boettcher* as above, S. 74 sq. In the discourses of Jesus, which were delivered in Syro-Chaldaic, many verbal allusions may have disappeared in the process of translating into Greek, cf. *Glass*. l.c. p. 1339. But the attempt of modern critics to restore some of them, as in Matt. viii. 21 (*Eichhorn*, Einl. ins N. T. I. 504 f.) and Jno. xiii. 1 (*μεταβῆ*, *Πῶς*, *Γῶς*), must be pronounced decidedly infelicitous.

Terent. Hecyr. prol. 1, 2 *orator* ad vos venio ornatu prologi, sinite 661
exorator sim.

That similar instances of paronomasia and annominatio would not be wanting in native Greek authors, particularly the orators, was naturally to be expected. Collections of them have been made by Tesmar, institut. rhetor. p. 156 ff.; Elsner, in diss. II. Paul. et Jesaias inter se comparati (Vratisl. 1821. 4to.) p. 24; Bremi, exc. 6 ad Isocr.; Weber, Demosth. p. 205. Cf. (further): Demosth. Aristocr. 457 b. ἀνθρώπους οὐδὲ ἐλευθέρους ἀλλ' ὀλέθρους, Plato, Phaed. 83 d. ὁμότροπός τε καὶ ὁμότροφος, Aesch. Ctesiph. § 78 οὐ τὸν τρόπον ἀλλὰ τὸν τόπον μόνον μετήλλαξεν, Strabo 9, 402 φάσκειν ἐκείνους συνθέσθαι ἡμέρας, νύκτωρ δὲ ἐπιθέσθαι, Antiph. 5, 91 εἰ δέοι ἁμαρτεῖν ἐπὶ τῇ, ἀδίκως ἀπολυθεῖν ὁσώτερον ἂν εἴη τοῦ μὴ δικάως ἀπολέσθαι, Diod. S. 11, 57 δόξας παραδόξως διασεσῶσθαι, Thuc. 2, 62 μὴ φρονήματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι (Rom. xii. 3), Lys. in Philon. 17; Xen. A. 5, 8, 21; Plat. rep. p. 580 b.; Lach. p. 188 b.; Diod. Sic. Exc. Vat. p. 27, 5; Appian. civ. 5, 132 τῶν νυκτοφυλάκων ἔθος καὶ εἶδος, Diog. L. 5, 17; 6, 4; Aelian. anim. 14, 1; see Bttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 150; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 138. In the Sept. and Fathers cf. especially Sus. 54, 55 εἰπόν, ὑπὸ τί δένδρον εἶδες αὐτοὺς . . . ὑπὸ σχῖνον. Εἶπε δὲ Δανιήλ . . . σχίσσει σε μέσον. 58, 59 εἶπεν ὑπὸ πρίνον. Εἶπε δὲ Δανιήλ . . . τὴν ῥομφαίαν ἔχων πρίσαι σε μέσον (cf. Africani ep. ad Orig. de hist. Susan. p. 220 ed. Wetsten.), 3 Esr. iv. 62 ἀνεσιν καὶ ἀφεςιν, Wisd. i. 10 ὅτι οὗς ζηλώσεως ἀκροᾷται τὰ πάντα καὶ θροῦς γογγυσμῶν οὐκ ἀποκρύπτεται, xiv. 5 θέλεις μὴ ἀργὰ εἶναι τὰ τῆς σοφίας σου ἔργα (cf. Grimm, Comment. on the Book of Wisdom, Introd. p. 40), Acta apocr. p. 243 ἐξ ἀπειρίας μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπορίας, Macar. hom. 2, 1 τὸ σῶμα οὐχὶ ἐν μέρος ἢ μέλος πάσχει. As to Latin, see Jani, ars poet. 423 sq.

3. Parallelismus membrorum, the well-known peculiarity of 594
Hebrew poetry, occurs also in the N. T. when the style rises to 7th ed.
the elevation of rhythm. This parallelism is sometimes *synonymous*, as in Matt. x. 26; Jno. i. 17; vi. 35; xiv. 27; Rom. ix. 2; xi. 12, 33; 1 Cor. xv. 54; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Heb. xi. 17; Jas. iv. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 3, etc., and sometimes *antithetic*, as in Rom. ii. 7; Jno. iii. 6, 20 f.; 1 Pet. iv. 6; 1 Jno. ii. 10, 17, etc. See, in particular, the hymn in Luke i. 46 ff.; cf. § 65, 5 p. 611 (E. G. Rhessa, de parallelismo sententiar. poet. in libris N. T. Regiom. 1811. II. 4; J. J. Snouk Hurgronje, de parallel. membrorum in J. Chr. dictis observando. Utr. 1836. 8vo.). Sometimes dogmatical statements which might be expressed in a single proposition are divided in this way into 563
parallel members, Rom. iv. 25; x. 10. Likewise 1 Tim. iii. 16, 6th ed.
where parallelism is accompanied with entire similarity of the 662

clauses, appears to be a quotation from one of the hymns of the apostolic church.

4. The Greek verses or parts of verses¹ found in the N. T. are of two sorts: they either belong to Greek poets and are quoted as theirs; or they make their appearance suddenly and without any sign of quotation, — whether because they were current poetic utterances of unknown authorship, or, as is more frequently the case, were let fall by the writer unconsciously, which sometimes occurs even in good prose writers, but was pronounced a blemish by the ancient teachers of rhetoric.² The apostle Paul alone has inwoven poetic quotations into his discourses, and in three passages (J. Hoffmann de Paulo apost. scripturas profanas ter allegante. Tubing. 1770. 4to.):

a. In Tit. i. 12 there occurs an entire hexameter, from Epi-
menides of Crete (ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης cf. vs. 5):

Κρητὲς αἰψὺν ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία γαστέρες ἀργαί.

b. Acts xvii. 28 contains the half of an hexameter:

του γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμεν,

595 cf. Arat. Phaenom. 5, where the conclusion of the verse runs thus:
7th ed. ὁ δ' ἥπιος ἀνθρώποισι (δεξιὰ σημαίνει), so that a spondee occurs in the fifth foot, as frequently happens, particularly in Aratus 10, 12, 32, 33.

c. In 1 Cor. xv. 33 there is an Iamb. trimeter acatalectus (senarius):

φθειρουσιν ἡ|θη χρησθ' ὁμ|λῖαι κακαί,

where, as often takes place, spondees are used in the odd feet 1 and 3 (Hm. doctr. metr. p. 74⁸). The quotation is from the well-known comic poet Menander, and, according to H. Stephanus, from his Thais (see Menandri Fragm. ed. Meineke p. 75, and Fragm.

¹ Loeffler, de versib. qui in soluta N. T. oratione habentur. L. 1718. 4to.; Koesgarten, de poetarum effatis graec. in N. T., also his Dissertatt. acad. ed. Mothnik p. 135 sqq.

² Cf. Cic. orat. 56, 189 (a passage erroneously quoted by Weber, Demosth. p. 208), Quintil. Instit. 9, 4, 52 72 sqq.; Fabric. biblioth. latin. ed. Ernesti II. 389; Noll, Antibar. under the word versus; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 52 sq.; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 315; Franke, Demosth. p. 6, likewise the Classical Journ. no. 45, p. 40 sqq. I have never seen the dissertation of Loeffler (Moeller) de versu inopinato in prosa. L. 1668. That condemnation of poetic insertions in prose, has been qualified and corrected by Hm. opusc. I. 121 sqq.

⁸ In Hm. doctr. metr. p. 139 *impari sede* is probably a misprint for *pari*.

comic. gr. ed. Meineke vol. 4 p. 132). However, the best Codd. 663 of the N. T. [Sin. also] give *χρηστά* without elision.

5. To the second of the above-mentioned classes¹ belong 564

a. The hexameter in Jas. i. 17, which even the old commentators^{6th ed.} had recognized :

πασα δο|σις αγα|θη και | παν δω|ρημα τε|λειον

(where, in the second foot in the arsis, *σις* might be used as long) ; see the commentators in loc. Schulthess tried to arrange the rest of the passage into two metrical verses ; but the rhythm is harsh, and the use of poetic words does not in James warrant us in inferring the presence of verses and restoring them by means of violent alterations and transpositions.

On the other hand b. an unmistakable hexameter occurs in Heb. xii. 13 in the words

και τροχ|ας ορ|θας ποι|ησατε | τοις ποσιν | ὑμων :

And c. in Acts xxiii. 5 the words quoted from the Sept. may be scanned as an Iamb. trimet. acatal. :

ἀρχον|τα του | λαου | σου ουκ | ερεις | κακως,

but, owing to the thrice occurring spondee in the 1st, 3d, and 4th 596 feet, it would be offensive to a Greek ear. 7th ed.

Lastly, in Jno. iv. 35 the words *τετράμηνος . . . ἔρχεται* have the rhythm of a trimeter acatalect., if read thus :

τετραμη|νος εσ|τι χῶ | θερισ|μός ερχ|εται.

The first foot is an anapaest (Hm. doct. metr. p. 119 sq.). As to *χῶ* for *καὶ ὁ*, see Bttm. I. 122.

¹ Hunting for such verse is so much the more a matter of idle curiosity, as prosaic rhythm is different from poetic and sometimes does not permit these passages to appear as verse ; Hm. as above, p. 124 ; Thiersch in the Munich gel. Anzeigen 1849. Bd. 28 nr. 118. We have adduced such passages only as by themselves furnish a complete thought. For half or incomplete sentences containing a rhythm, see the Classical Journal, as above, p. 46 sq. Also in 2 Pet. ii. 22 some have, by combining the two proverbs, framed Iambic verses, see Bengel.

INDEX.

I. INDEX OF PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS.

The Figures refer to Pages.

Abbreviations popular 102.

Abnormal relation of words in a sentence 631 sqq.

Abounding verbs of, with the gen. 261.

Absolute cases 181; gen. 307 sq.; dat. 220; acc. 181, 231, 574.

Abstracts often without the art. 120; in the plur. 176; joined to concretes 536.

Accentuation 49 sqq.; distinguishes forms 53 sq.; of enclitic pron. 54.

Accusative the, with trans. verbs 221 sqq.; of kindred signification 224; of place after verbs of motion 224; of object, not expressed by *ἐν* (ᾧ) 226; double 226 sqq.; after passives 229; as remote object 229 sqq.; specification of time and place 230; of closer specification 230; adverbial 464; absolute 181, 231, 574; with infin. 321; after *ἵνα* 573; of neut. pron. or adj. added to verb 227.

Accusing verbs of, with the gen. 203.

Active Verbs transitive 251 etc.; for reflexives 251; for passives 252; for middle 255 sq.

Adjectives inflection and comparison of 68 sqq.; derivative and compound 96 sqq.; with subst. and art. 131 sq.; used as subst. take the art. 108 sq.; neut. as subst. 95, 234, 517; with the voc. 183; subst. used for 236 sq.;

alleged Hebr. use of fem. for neut. 238; comparison of 239 sqq.; used for adverbs 463; position of 523 sqq.; two or more without a copula 525; referring to substs. of different gen. or numb. 526 sq.; predicate 528; can they be omitted? 594 sq.; of result, proleptic use of 624; supposed abnormal relation of 624 sq.

Adverbs in *ο* or *ει* 43 sq.; used with art. for nouns 109; relative often include def. 159; prepositions combined with 422 sq.; prepositions used for 102, 423; N. T. writers masters of 462; use of adjs. and substs. for 463 sq.; are they used for adjs.? 465; adverbial notions expressed by the dat. or the part. 466; treated as verbal 467 sq.; used as prepositions 470 sq.; of place interchanged 471 sq.; irregular position of 553; no ellipsis of 595.

Aeolisms 36, 76, 83.

Alexandrian dialect 21; orthography 48; version (Sept.) 31 sq. 37 sq.

Amplification 523 sqq.; predicative 527.

Anacoluthon punctuation of 58; 168; in the Rev. 535 sq.; 566 sqq.; instances of peculiarly Greek 572 sqq.

Annominatio 637 sq.

Antiptosis 636.

Antithesis 441 sqq. 538, 540 sq.

Aorist used for pluperf. 275; for perf. ? 276; only in appearance for fut. 277; never in N. T. expresses what *is wont* to be etc. 277; for pres. ? 278; de conatu ? 278 sqq.; aor. mid. for pass. ? 255; aor. pass. for mid. ? 261; Aeolic form of 1st aor. opt. 76; 2d aor. with ending *a* 73 sq.

Apodosis how introduced 541; doubled 541 sq.; omitted 599; in condensed structure 619.

Aposiopesis 599 sqq.

Apostrophe rare use of in N. T. 40 sq.

Apposition use of art. with words in 138; kinds of 528 sq.; construction of 529 sq.; so-called gen. of 531; to the voc. put in nom. 533; to a whole clause 533; position of 534; in breviloquence 624.

Aramaisms in N. T. 27 sq.

Arrangement of words etc. see **Position**.

Article the, as a pron. 104 sq.; before nouns 105 sqq.; generic 106; not used for a pronominal adj. 107; not used for rel. pron. 107; for possess. pron. 108; peculiarly Greek use of 108 sq.; with adjs. and parts. used as subst. 108; with *πολλοί* 110; with *οἱ* or *ἐκεῖνοι* 110; with *πάντες* 110 sq.; with *τοιοῦτοι* 111; with *ἐκαστος* 111; with *αὐτός* 112; with proper names 112; with the pred. 114; indefinitely ? 115; when optional 115 sq.; the indef. (*τις*) expressed sometimes by *εἷς* ? 117; its use or omission sometimes a characteristic of style 118; variation of MSS. as to use of 118; omission of with nouns denoting single objects etc. 119 sq.; with abstracts 120; with nouns rendered def. by a gen. 125; with a numeral 125 sq.; its use and omission with nouns connected by *καί* 126 sqq.; by *ἤ* 127; with attributives 131 sqq.; with attrib. part. 134; with a part. in a derivative force 135; when omitted with adjuncts 135 sqq.; use of with words in apposition 138; with an attributive joined to an anarthrous noun 139 sq.; with the infin. 320, 324.

Asyndeton 58, 520, 537 sqq.

Atticisms 36.

Attraction of the relative 163; by the relative 164; of the relative by a noun following 166; in structure 544, 625 sqq.

Augment temp. for syllab. 70; of verbs beginning with *ev* 71; double 72; omitted 72 sq.

Beth essentiae 38, 184, 513.

Blended constructions as causing redundancies 605.

Breviloquence (brachylogy) 619 sq.

Breathings over *p* 48.

Broken and heterogeneous structure 566 sqq.

Buying etc. verbs of, take gen. of price 206.

Cardinals repeated assume a distributive sense 249; use of the sing. to signify *one* 249; arrangement of in combinations 250.

Caring for verbs of, with the gen. 205.

Cases in general 179 sqq.; no enallage of 180; absolute 181, 220, 231. Cf. **Absolute cases**.

Cause dative of 216.

Chiasmus 411.

Cilicisms in N. T. 27.

Circumlocutions use of prepositions in 423 sqq.

Circumstantiality of style 605 sqq.

Clause necessary contents of a grammatical 56 sq., 512; want of connection of clauses 537 sq.; connection of by particles 539 sqq.; contrasted 540; connected by forms of inflection (infin. or part.) 543; position of 546 sqq., of a relative 167, 542; rhetorical transposition of 549; trajectory of 551 sq., 560; one expressed twice 610; one resolved into two 629 sq. Cf. **Structure of sentences**.

Collectives with a plur. pred. and with a sing. 515 sq.; with plur. adj. 526.

Comma use of 56 sqq.; a half comma desirable 59.

Comparative of adverbs 69 sq.; of adj. sometimes formed by the pos. with *μᾶλ-*

- λόν* a prep. or *ή* 240; strengthened by *μᾶλλον* 240; strengthened by a prep. 240; used for the pos. ? 242; for the superl. ? 242; in loose reference 245.
- Comparison**, of adjectives 69; abbreviated 245, 623.
- Compound words** formation of 99 sqq.; substantives 99 sq. 101; adjectives 100; verbs 100 sq. 102; adverbs 102; proper names 102 sq.
- Conjunctions** use of 433 sq.; conjunctive 434 sqq.; disjunctive 440 sq.; adverbative 441 sq.; temporal, inferential, causal 444 sqq.; final and objective 449; not interchanged, nor weakened 449 sqq.; position of 119, 558 sq.; no ellipsis of 595.
- Constructio ad sensum** 141, 147, 513 sqq. 525 sqq. 631.
- Constructio praeagnans** 621.
- Construction** see Structure of sentences.
- Contraction** 46, 102.
- Copula** agrees in number with subj. 513 sq.; omitted 521, 584 sq.
- Correlation** 440.
- Crisis** 46.
- Dative** the, of pers. pron. apparently pleonastic 155; after verbs 208 sq.; after *εἶναι* and *γίνεσθαι* 210; after substantives 211; of relation (*opinion*, *interest*, *commodi* and *incommodi*) 211 sq.; *eis* and *ἐν* in periphrasis for 212, 217; for the local *πρός* and *eis* 214; related to *μετά* 214; with verbs of coming 215; in reference to which (the sphere, the standard, the cause and motive) 215 sq.; instrumental 216; use of *ἐν*, *κατά*, *διὰ* etc. for 217; of time, whether a point or a period 218; of place 219; with passives 219; absolute 220; double 220 sq.; of the infin. 328; after *ἐν* 384 sqq.; after *σύν* 391; after *ἐνί* 392 sq.; after *παρά* 394; after *πρός* 395.
- Dawes's rule** 507.
- Declension** rare forms of the 1st 60; of the 2d 62; of the 3d 64; declension of foreign words 66; of adjectives 68.
- Defective** structure 580 sqq. Cf. Structure of sentences.
- Defective Verbs** 81 sqq.
- Demonstrative pronouns** neut. used adverbially 142; irregular reference of 157; included in the relative 158; repetition of 159 sq.; before *ὅτι*, *ὅσα* etc. 161; before a pred. infin. or a subst. 161; before a particip. constr. 161; the plur. for sing. 162; position of 162; omitted in cases of attraction 165 sq.; in loose reference 632.
- Deponent Verbs** 258 sq.
- Derivation** by terminations: of verbs 91, of substantives 93, of adjectives 96; by composition: of substantives 99, of adjectives 100, of verbs 100 sq.
- Desiring** verbs of, take the gen. 204.
- Dialect** the Alexandrian 20, 21; the Hellenistic 28; the Christian 35.
- Digressions** 565.
- Diminutives** 96.
- Discord** supposed, between subj. and pred. 517.
- Disjoining** verbs of, take prep. 197.
- Distributives** how expressed in N. T. 249.
- Doric** forms etc. 36.
- Dual** the, not found in N. T. 177.
- Elision** comparatively rare in N. T. 40.
- Ellipsis** with adj. 234; 580 sqq.; of the copula 584 sq.; of the subj. 588; list of substs. often omitted 590; of the noun with trans. verbs 593; none of adv. or conj. 595; partial of both subj. and pred. in the same clause 596; of a whole proposition 598; in quotations from O. T. 599.
- Enallage** of gend. in pronouns 141; of numb. in the same 141; of the gend. and numb. of nouns 174 sq.; of cases 180; of tenses 264; of prep. 361, 411; of numb. with verbs 515; of gend. with verbs 517.
- Enclitics** how to be written 54; position of 558.
- Enjoying** verbs of, with the gen. 197.
- Epexegetical** apposition 528; gen. 531.
- Extension** of subj. or pred. of a prop. 523 sqq.

Feeling verbs of, with the gen. 204.

Feminine the, is the neut. used for ? 179, 238; in contempt 172.

Foreign Words declens. of 66 sq.

Forms rare of the 1st or 2d declens. 60 sq.; of the 3d declens. 64 sq.; of regular verbs 73 sq.; of verbs in *μ* etc. 78 sq.

Fritzsche K. F. A. 10.

Fulness of expression 605, 609 sqq.

Future the, Attic 75; subjunctive 75; mid. for pass. 255; ethical (*may* or *should*) 279; 3d fut. pass. 279; not used for the pret. 280; sometimes nearly equiv. to the pres. 280; of a supposable case 280; supposed equiv. to the optat. 280; for the impera. 315.

Gataker Thom. 14.

Gender of Nouns new 36, 68, 65; 174 sqq.; the neut. used of a person 178; supposed interchange of 178 sq.; supposed contemptuous force of fem. 179; a noun of any gend. taken merely as a word is treated as neut. 179.

Genitive the, of pron. position of 155; import and use of 184 sqq.; objective 185; and subjective 186; of remote dependence 187 sqq.; of local and temporal reference (see below) 187 sq.; of relationship 190, 593; several gov. one by another 190; separated from governing noun 155, 191; two of different signif. (pers. and thing) 191; placed *before* its noun 192, 551; supposed use of *πρὸ*, *ἀπὸ*, *ἐκ*, *παρὰ*, *ἐν*, *κατὰ*, *ἐν* in circumlocution for 192 sq.; with adjs. and parts. 194; after *ἐλθαι* or *γίνεσθαι* 195; of separation and removal 196; with verbs of the senses, and of beginning, receiving, begging, giving etc. 197 sq.; partitive 200 sqq.; gov. by an adverb 203; partit. gen. as subject 203; with verbs of accusing, boasting, smelling 203 sq.; with verbs of feeling, longing, remembering, caring for, ruling 204 sqq.; of price 206; of place and of time 207; absol. 207, 544; of material 237; with the compar. 239 sq.; of apposition 531.

Georgi Ch. Sgm. 15.

Giving verbs of, with the gen. 197.

Grammar N. T., scope and treatment of 1 sq.; history of 5 sqq.; works upon 10 sq.; grammat. peculiarities of later Gr. 26 sq.; of the language of the N. T. 36 sq.

Greek later, peculiarities of 20 sqq.

Haab Ph. H. 6.

Hebraisms opinions on 13 sqq.; errors of writers concerning 29 sq.; definition of 30; perfect and imperfect 31; specified 32 sqq. 38 sq.; in connection with certain pronouns (*ωὗς*) 171 sq.; *ἐς* and *ἐν* in supposed circumlocution for the nom. 183; supposed Hebr. use of a fem. adj. for neut. 238; supposed use of *ὡς* etc. for adjs. (employed as subs.) 238; Hebr. superl. 246; supposed Hebr. interchange of tenses 264; in use of imperatives 311.

Hellenistic Dialect the term 28; its peculiarities cf. 22 sqq.

Hendiadyse 680.

Heterogeneous Structure 577 sq.

Hiatus 40 sq.

Hypallage 684.

Hyperbaton 555 sq.

Hypodistole the 46.

Hypothetical Sentences, four kinds of etc. 291 sqq.

Hysteron Proteron 553.

Imperative the, 3d pers. plur. of 76; usual import of 310; permissive 311; two connected by *καί* 311; aor. and pres. distinguished in N. T. 313 sq.; perfect 315; substitutes for 315 sq.

Imperfect the use of 268 sqq.; apparently for the aor. 269; never for the pluperf. 269; conjoined with the aor. 270; apparently for the pres. 270.

Impersonal Verbs 522, 538.

Indeclinable Words accent of 52; 61, 67.

Indefinite (article) pron. (*τις*) sometimes expressed by *ἐς* 117; use of 170; position of 170 sq.

Indicative the, distinguished from the subjunc. and the opt. 281; imperf. sometimes used for our subjunc. 282; pres. in direct questions to be distinguished from the subjunc. 284; after particles of design 289; with *ἔν* 295; with particles of time 296; with interrogatives in indirect quest. 298; after *εἰ*, *εἰ ἔρα*, *εἴπω* 300; in the orat. obliq. 301; with *ὅτε* 301 sq.; with *ἔν* 302 sqq.

Infinitive the, for the imperat. 316; epexegetic 318, 326; as the subject 319; as the object 321 sq.; in the oblique cases, especially to express design 324 sq.; with the art. 320, 323, 324; after *ἐγένετο* 323; with *ἔστί* 320 sq.; with the acc. 321, 323; with *τοῦ* 324 sqq.; with *τῷ* 328; with preps. 328 sq.; after *πρὶν* 330; pres. and aor. distinguished in N. T. 380 sq.; perf. 381, 384; with *μέλλαν* 37, 383; *ἵνα* sometimes used for 380, 384 sqq.; sometimes gives place to a clause with *εἰ*, *ἔν* etc. 320; in modern Gr. 386; act. apparently for pass. 339; after *ὅτι* 339; 573; in imitation of Hebr. infin. absol. 389; as a means of connection 548.

Interjections 356.

Interrogative, neut. of *τίς* used adverbially 142; particles, how construed 298, 508 sqq.; clauses 543, two interrog. predicates blended 628.

Interrupted Structure 561 sqq.

Ionio forms 36, 62, 84 sq.

Iota subscript 46 sq.

Jews the, how learned Greek 20 sqq.; Jewish Greek 27 sqq.

Language two aspects of 1; of N. T. history of opinions concerning 12 sqq.; basis of 20 sqq.; Hebrew-Aramaic tinge of 27 sq.; grammatical character of 35 sqq.

Latin its influence on Byzantine Greek 28; Lat. terminations of patronymics 95; words in N. T. Greek 103.

Letters interchange of in Alex. orthog. 48.

Lexicography 1.

Lexicology 1.

Masculine supposed to be used for the fem. 178.

Metaplasms 63.

Middle Voice *ισ* force 252 sqq.; of mental objects 253; in a new signification 253, 254; with acc. often has the pron. expressed 254; expressive of the subject's order or permission 254; in reciprocal sense 254; tenses sometimes in pass. sense 254 sq.; active sometimes used for 255; act. and mid. sometimes interchangeable 256; with *ἑαυτῷ* 257; apparently for active 258; mid. verbs to be distinguished from deponent 258 sq.; too many verbs regarded as in 252.

Moods lax use of with particles 36; use of in independent propositions 282 sq.; in dependent propositions 287 sqq.; with particles of design 287; in hypothetical sentences 291; with particles of time 296; with interrogatives 298; in oratio obliqua 300; with *ἔστω* 301; with *ἔν* 302 sqq.; after conditional clauses 303; in relative clauses 306; in indirect questions 308; after particles of time 308. Cf. Imperative, Indicative, Infinitive, etc.

Names of persons, from oxytones throw back the accent 51; indeclinable accented on last 52; contracted 102 sq.; with the art. 112 sq.

Negation (473 sqq.) continued 487; unconditional, in antithesis or followed by *ἀλλὰ* 496; in oaths expressed by *εἰ* 500; in interrogative sentences 510.

Negative Particles 473 sqq.; objective and subjective 473; use of *μή* 476 sq.; in relative clauses with *ἔν* 480; with the infin. 481; with participles 482; in succession 487 sqq.; after an affirmative sentence or followed by *ἀλλὰ* 495; two in a single clause 498; with the moods 500 sqq.; in dependent clauses 502; the intensive *ὅτι* *μή* 505 sq.; in interrog. sentences 510.

Neuter used of persons 178; for the fem. 178; verbs connected with their pred. nouns by preps. 282 sq.; plur., when joined to a sing. and when to a plur. verb 514; adj. used as subst. 517;

- neut. adj. or part. referring to a whole clause 533.
- N. T. Grammar**, Language, etc. see Grammar, Language etc.
- Nominative** the, absolute 181, 574; titular 181 sq.; for the voc. 182; in exclamations 183, 532; supposed circumlocution for by means of *els* 183; by means of *ev* 184.
- Nouns**, proper with altered accent 50 sq.; derived from verbs 93 sq.; in *μὸς* 93; in *κα* and *οὐς* 93; in *μὴν* 93; derived from adjectives 94 sq.; in *της* 94; in *ων* 94; in *ων* 95; in *κα* 95; in *ημιον* 96; in *ας* 102 sq.; proper with the art. 112; list of anarthrous 120 sqq.; used instead of the pron. 144; antecedent incorporated into the relative clause 164; Hebr. repetition of for every 174, 463; several plur. in Greek though sing. in English 176; of kindred signification, with verbs 224; substituted for adjs. 236; list of often omitted 590 sqq. Cf. Abstracts, Collectives, Gender, Number, etc.
- Number**: use of plur. pronouns referring to a sing. noun 141; of nouns, collective use of the sing. 174; plur. of category 175; plur. used in Greek, though we use the sing. 176; dual does not occur in N. T. 177; use of plur. to signify two 177; neut. sing. or plur. used of persons 178; use of sing. to signify one 249; of the pred. differing from that of the subj. 513 sqq.; plur. used of himself by speaker 517.
- Numerals** 248 sqq.; use of card. for ord. in expressing first day of week 248; ordinal, abbreviated use of 249; cardinal in distributive sense 249; arrangement of in combinations 250; construction of with *εἰς* 250.
- Object** gen. of 186; a single belonging to two verbs 521.
- Optative** the, distinguished from the indic. and subjunc. 281; use of in independ. prop. 286; in depend. prop. 288; after *κα* 290 sq.; after *ει* 293; after a particle of time 297; after an interrogative 299; in the oratio obliqua 300 sq.; with *εἰ* 303; in indirect quest. 308, 310.
- Oratio Variata** 577 sqq.; mingling of orat. rect. and obliq. 301, 545, 579.
- Ordinals** a peculiar abbreviated use of 249. Cf. Numerals.
- Orthography** variations of in MSS. 40; Alexandrian 43, 48.
- Parallelism** antithetic 610, 639; not pleonastic 611; synonymous 639.
- Parataxis** 630.
- Parathetic apposition** 528.
- Parentheses** in N. T. 562 sq.; in the historical books 563 sq.; in the epistles 565.
- Paronomasia** 636 sq.
- Partaking** verbs of, with the gen. 200.
- Partitive** gen. 200 sqq., as subject 203, 513; partitive apposition 528.
- Participle** the, as a subst. takes the art. 108, 353; as an attributive, takes or omits the art. 134; its verbal character 340; use of pres. 341 sqq. 353; fut. 340; aor. 342 sq.; perf. pass. 343; construction of 343; to be resolved by a particle of time 344; with *καὶ* or *καὶ* 344; two or more in different relations without a copula 344; apparently for an infin. yet different 345 sq.; periphrastic construction with *εἰς* 348 sq.; is it ever used for the finite verb 350 sqq.; with the gen. 354; in imitation of the Hebr. infin. absol. 354; absolutely, referring to a clause 533 sq.; with the art. as pred. 513; as a means of connection between clauses 543; in abnormal case, particularly the nom. 572.
- Particles** the, lax use of in N. T. 36; how certain should be written 45; of design, how construed 287; of time 296, 308; in general 356 sqq.; how classified 356; comparatively frugal use of in N. T. 357; works on 358; position of 358; no ellipsis of 595. Cf. Interrogative, Negative etc.
- Passor G. 5.**
- Passive** the, with the dat. 219; with the acc. 229, 260; 1st aor. used for the

classic 1st aor. mid. 261; perf. and pluperf. in mid. sense 262; perf. supposed to be used for perf. act. 262; fut., singular use of 262 sq.; is it ever used like the Hebr. Hophal? 263; forms, how to be distinguished from the same in the middle voice 263.

Paul his knowledge of Greek 21; his doctrinal system as a guide to his language 98, 130; his use of the art. with *Χριστός* 118; his multiplication of relatives 167; his use of the gen. of more remote internal relations 188; his separation of the gen. from its noun 191; his use of the infin. with *εἰς* or *πρός* 329; fond of participial constructions 355; his doctrinal use of prepositions 360; his accumulation of prepositions 418; his bold arrangement of words 547; his use of parentheses 565 sq.; and *anacolutha* 567 sq.; fond of *paronomasia* 636.

Perception verbs of, with the gen. 199.

Perfect the, pass. for mid. 262; pass. said to be used for act. 262; its import and use 270 sq.; in connection with the aor. 272; for the aor. in narration 272; how far used for the pres. 272 sq.; prophetic 273; supposed use of for pluperf. 274; in sense of pres. 274.

Periodic Structure in the N. T. 545.

Personal Pronouns multiplied in N. T. 143; occasionally omitted 143; occasional use of nouns for 144; loose reference of 145 sq.; repetition of 147 sq.; in nom. always emphatic 152; position of 155; dat. apparently superfluous 155; *ἡ ψυχὴ μου* etc. in circumlocution for? 156.

Persons rare forms of, in regular verbs 75 sqq.

Pfochen Seb. 13.

Place gen. of 207; dat. of 219; acc. of after verbs of motion 224; as a specification 230.

Pleonasm 601 sqq.; causes of 602; for the most part circumstantiality or fulness 605 sq.; supposed instances of examined 612 sqq.

Pluperfect augment of omitted 72; pass. in mid. sense 262; of certain

verbs. equiv. to imperf. 274; when expressed by the aor. 275.

Plural the, of category 175; of certain nouns used for the sing. 176; of names of countries and cities 176; of nouns denoting a feeling etc. 176; Hebr. *plur. maj.* or *excellentie* 177; for the dual 177; neut. used of a person 178; used of himself by the speaker 517.

Polysyndeton 519, 540.

Position of words and clauses 546 sqq.; how determined 546; works on 546 sq.; in N. T. simple 547; in the apostolic benediction 549; of the vocative 549; causes of unusual 549; of the predicate 551; of the gen. before its noun 155, 192, 551; trajection 551 sq.; *hysteron proteron* 553; irregular, of single words, particularly certain adverbs and negatives 553 sq.; of *πρό*, *ἀπό* etc. in specifications of place and time 557 sq.; of particles and enclitic pronouns 558; supposed transposition of clauses 560; as affected by a regard to sound 636 sq. Cf. *Adjectives*, *Apposition* etc.

Positive the, with *μᾶλλον* a prep. or *ἢ* instead of the compar. 240; for the superl. 246.

Possessive Pronouns 143 sqq.; sometimes to be taken objectively 153; *ἵδιος* used for 153 sq.; circumlocutions for 154 sq.

Predicate the art. with 114; its connection with the subj. 512 sqq.; a clause as 513; consisting of a part. with the art. 513; *grammat. discord* between pred. (or copula) and subj. 513 sqq.; *grammat. form* of compound 518; several, how connected 519; several with a common object 521; indispensable 521; extended by adjuncts 523 sqq.; 527; when placed first 551.

Prepositions predilection for in N. T. 32, 38, 180; compound 102; connecting a (neut.) verb with its dependent noun 232 sq.; for adverbs 250, 423; general remarks on 358 sqq.; the proper sense of to be distinguished from the metaphorical 360; interchange of 361 sq. 411 sq.; interchange

of cases with 363; position of 363; with the gen. 364 sqq.; with the dat. 384 sqq.; with the acc. 396 sqq.; the same in the same sentence used to denote different relations 409; different in the same sentence 410 sq.; kindred substituted for each other in parallel passages 411 sq.; *et* and *etis* not used indiscriminately 413 sqq.; accumulation of by Paul 418; repetition of 419 sq.; omitted before the relative 421 sq.; combined with adverbs 422; in circumlocutions 154, 192, 423; after compound verbs 425 sqq.; two blended into one 629.

Present the, its force 265; only in appearance for the fut. 265; for the aor. in narration 266 sq.; conjoined with the aor. 267; may include also a past tense 267; in dependent clauses apparently for the imperf. 268; perfs. and aor. equiv. to 274; with force of perf. 274. Cf. Aorist, Future, Perfect.

Prophetic Perfect the Hebr. 276.

Pronouns enclitic 54; indef. expressed sometimes by *eis* 117; use of in N. T. 140 sqq.; differing in gend. or numb. from their noun 141; in supposed reference to a following noun 142; neuter used adverbially 142; personal and possessive 143 sqq.; repetition of 147 sq.; demonstrative 157 sqq.; relative 163 sqq.; interrogative and indefinite 168 sqq.; Hebraisms in connection with 171 sqq.; in loose reference 632 sq. Cf. Demonstrative, Personal etc.

Proper Names throw back the accent 51; contracted forms of 102; with the art. 112 sqq.

Proposition see Clause and Structure.

Protasis 291. Cf. Apodosis.

Prozeugma of the demonstr. pron. 162.

Punctuation of the N. T. 55 sqq.

Purists the, history of 12 sqq.; a criticism of their efforts 16.

Questions rel. pron. put for interrog. in direct 167; the subjunc. in undetermined 285; indirect 298 sq. 308, 543; negative 510 sq.; with the fut. for the

imperat. 315; brachylogy in 628. Cf. Interrogative.

Quotation peculiar biblical formula of 522.

Redundant Structure 601 sqq.

Reduplication 72 sqq.; of verbs in *p* 74 sq.

Reflexive Pronoun used in reference to the 1st and 2d pers. 150 sq.; with the middle voice 257.

Relative Pronouns thought to refer sometimes to the more remote noun 157; include the demonstrative 158; attraction with 163 sqq.; agree sometimes with following noun 166; for interrogative 167; multiplied by Paul 167; before whole clauses 168; not used for demonstrative 168.

Relative Clauses position of 167; use of 542 sq.

Revelation book of, its irregularities of style 534.

Rhetoric (stylistics) of N. T. 1 sq.

Ruling verbs of, with the gen. 206.

Schema κατ' ἑξῆς 520.

Sentence see Clause, and Structure.

Septuagint its Greek style 31 sq. 37 sqq.

Singular (the distributive) for the plural 174.

Smelling verbs of, with the gen. 203.

Structure of Sentences: of a simple 512 sqq.; of compound 518 sqq.; by extension of subj. or pred. 523 sqq.; their connection 537 sqq.; asyndeton 537; polysyndeton 519, 540; position of words and clauses in 546 sqq.; interrupted (parenthetic) structure 561 sqq.; broken and heterogeneous (anacoluthon 566, oratio variata 577) 566 sqq.; defective (ellipsis 580, aposiopesis 599) 580 sqq.; redundant (pleonasm 601, blended 605, circumstantiality 605, fulness 609) 601 sqq.; condensed and expanded (breviloquence 619, constructio praeagnans 621, attraction 625, hendiadys 630) 619 sqq.; irregularities of relating to single words (hypallage) 631 sqq.; regard to sound in (parono-

masia 636, annominatio 638, parallelism 639, verse 640) 636 sqq. Cf. Clauses, Asyndeton, Attraction, Position, etc.

Style (stylistics) in N. T. 1 sq. 31, 33, 35, 37 sq.; of individual writers 4, 29, 33, 39, 118, 346 sq. Cf. Paul etc.

Subject the, in relation to the art. 115; gen. of 186; relation to the sentence 512 sqq.; a partitive gen. may be used for 203, 513; relation of copula and predicate to 513 sqq.; compound 518; one rendered prominent 519, 520; may be implied 521 sq.; extension of 523 sqq.; wanting 588, 631; sudden change of 631 sq.

Subjunctive the future 75, 86; distinguished from the Indic. and the optat. 281; in independent propositions 285 sq.; in dependent propositions 287 sqq.; in hypothetical sentences 291 sq.; after particles of time compounded with *ἄν* 297, 308; after interrogatives 298; after *ἔσσε* 301; in relative clauses with *ἄν* 307; with *ὅσα* for the imperat. 315; with *ὅσα* for the infin. 334 sqq.

Substantives see Nouns.

Superlative the, circumlocution for 246; Hebr. modes of expressing 246 sq.; strengthened by *πλεον* 248.

Synizesis 622.

Synonymes 611.

Syntax peculiarities of, few in later and N. T. Greek 27; 36 sqq.

Technical Terms religious in N. T. 35.

Tenses rare forms in 73 sqq.; how far interchanged 264; import and use of the pres. 265 sq.; imperfect 268 sq.; perfect 270 sq.; aorist 275 sq.; force of in the moods 281; future 279 sq.; different connected 280 sq. Cf. Aorist etc.

Thinking of verbs expressing take the gen. 205.

Time gen. of 207; dat. of 213; acc. of 229 sq.; particles of, how construed 296 sq., with *ἄν* 308.

Touching laying hold of, verbs of take the gen. 201.

Trajection (transposition) of words 513 sqq.; of clauses 560.

Transition from a participial constr. to a finite verb 573; from *ὅτι* to the (acc. with) infin. 573; from a relative constr. to a personal 579; from oratio obliq. to rect. and vice versa 579; from the sing. to the plur. and the reverse 580. Cf. Structure of sentences.

Verbs augm. and redupl. of 70 sqq.; rare forms in tenses and persons of regular 73 sqq.; in verbs in *μ* and irregular verbs 78 sqq.; list of defective 82 sqq.; later forms of not always used in N. T. 90; same forms may come from different 91; derivative 91; compound 100; decomposite 102; intransitives with acc. of thing 227; neut. used transitively 251, 263; compounded with prepositions, how construed 425 sqq.; with *ἀπό* 427; with *ἀνά* 428; with *ἀπρί* 429; with *ἐκ* 429; with *ἐν* 429; with *ἐκ* 430; with *ἐν* 430; with *ἐκ* 431; with *κατά* 431; with *μετά* 432; with *παρά* 432; with *πρό* 432; with *πρός* 432; with *σύν* 433; with *ὅτι* 433; with *ὅτι* 433; in circumlocutions for adverbs 467 sq. Cf. Active etc.; Tenses etc.

Verbal substantives 93 sqq. (cf. nouns); adjectives 96 sq.

Verses found in N. T. 640 sq.

Vocative use of nom. for 182; most frequently without *ὦ* 183; position of 549.

Voices see Active, Middle, Passive.

Vorst J. 14.

Words see Derivation, Position, Paronomasia etc.

Wyss Caspar 5.

Zeugma 622.

II. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND FORMS.

The Figures refer to Pages.

α privative, intensive, formative 100.
 -α, -ᾱ in the gen. 60.
 α in forms of 2d aor. 73.
 ᾱ for δι' ᾱ 142.
 Ἀαρών 67.
 Ἀβιδά accent 52.
 ἀγαθοεργεῖν 26.
 ἀγαθοποιεῖν 25.
 ἀγαθὸς πρὸς τι and εἰς τι 363.
 ἀγαθουργεῖν 25, 101.
 ἀγαθωσύνη 25.
 ἀγαλλῶν 24.
 ἀγαλλίασις 25.
 ἀγανακτεῖν constr. of 232.
 ἀγάπη without art. 120; θεοῦ or Χριστοῦ 185.
 Ἄγαρ, τό 179.
 ἀγγέλλω forms of 82.
 ἔγγελοι art. with 124; ἔγγελοι and οἱ ἔγγ. 124.
 ἀγενεαλόγητος 25, 26.
 τὰ ἔγια 176, 177; ἡ ἔγια ἐγίω 246; οἱ ἐγιοι 35, 234; ἔγιον, τό 592.
 ἁγιασμός 93.
 ἁγιότης 25.
 ἁγρίεσθαι 252.
 ἁγροεῖν ἐν 629.
 ἁγρότης 25.
 ἄγρυμι forms of 82.
 ἀγορά without art. 121.
 ἀγόραιοι accent 53; sc. ἡμέραι 590.
 ἀγρίλαιος 25.
 ἀγρός without art. 121.
 ἄγω forms of 82; ἄγε with plur. subject 516; ἄγ. τινὶ 215; ἔγωμεν 251.
 ἀγωνίζομαι 260.
 ἀδελφός supposed ellipsis of 593.
 ἀδικεῖσθαι 254.
 ἀδροτής 52 sq.
 αἰ position of 553.
 αἰτός 22.

ἄζυμα 176.
 -αῖω verbs in 92.
 ἄθως ἀπό τ. 180, 197.
 Αἴγυπτος always has art. 112.
 αἷμα 30; αἷμα ἐκχέειν 33; αἵματα 177.
 αἵματεκχυσία 25, 26, 99.
 αἰνεῖν with dat. 536.
 -αινω aor. of verbs in 75; verbs in 92.
 αἶρειν sc. τὰς ἀγκύρας 564.
 αἰρετίζω 26.
 αἰρέω forms of 82; αἰροῦμαι 253.
 αἰσχύνομαι with part. and with infin. 346.
 αἰτεῖν constr. of 227.
 αἵτημα 24.
 αἰχμαλωτεύειν 25.
 αἰχμαλωτίζειν 25.
 αἰῶνες 176; οἱ αἰῶν. τῶν αἰών. 247.
 αἰῶνιος inflec. 69.
 ἀκαίρως 463.
 ἀκατάρτιστος 236.
 ἀκμήν 464.
 ἀκολουθεῖν ὀπίσω 214, 234.
 ἀκοντίζω 26.
 ἀκούω forms of 82; constr. of 199 sq. 347; signific. of 274.
 ἀκρόβυστος, ἀκροβυστία 24, 99.
 ἀκρογωνιαίος 236.
 ἀλλόλητος 23, 97.
 ἀλείφειν constr. of 227.
 ἀλεκτοροφωνία 25.
 ἀλέκτωρ 23.
 Ἀλεξᾶς 25.
 ἀλήθειν 22.
 ἀλλὰ distinguished from δέ 441 sq.; in abrupt transitions 442; οὐκ ... ἀλλὰ 442; ἀλλ' ἢ 442; not used for οὐ 451; nor for εἰ μή 451; nor for ἀπερ 451; after a single neg. 495; before apod. 541; ἀλλὰ γε 559; ἀλλ' ἔγωγε 620.
 ἀλλὰςσεω constr. of 206.

ἄλλομαι forms of 82.

ἄλλος in apposition 529; position of 548; omitted 595.

ἄλλοτρισεπίσκοπος 25, 99.

ἄμα 470.

ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτέω forms of 82; constr. of 233.

ἁμαρτία without art. 120.

ἁμφί does not occur in N. T. 372.

-αν for ασι in perf. 76; ἄν in infin. omits : subscr. 47.

ἄν force and use of 302 sqq.; omission of 282, 305 sq. 307, 333, 595; for ἰάν 291; in relative clauses 306; in indirect question 308.

ἀνά with the acc. 398; constr. of verbs compounded with 428.

ἀνάβα 79.

ἀνάγκη 30.

ἀνδρεμα 24, 32.

ἀναθεματίζειν 33.

ἀνακαινός 26.

ἀνακάμπτειν 251.

ἀνακείσθαι 23.

ἀνακλίνειν 23.

ἀνανεοῦσθαι 263.

ἀναξίως 463.

ἀνάπεσαι 74.

ἀναπίπτειν 23.

ἀναστρέφειν 251, 469.

ἀνόστασις νεκρῶν 188.

ἀνότεμα 24.

ἀνατέλλειν 251.

ἀνατίθηναι 253.

ἀνατολαί 176.

ἀνέλεος 100.

ἀνεπαίσχυντος 236.

ἄνεν 471.

ἀνέχομαι augm. of 72; forms of 83.

ἄνῃρ (φονεύς etc.) 30; without art. 122; ἄνδρες in addresses 610.

ἁμαρτάνειν ἁμαρτίαν 225.

ἄνθρωπος 25.

ἀνίστημι σπέρμα τινί 33; ἀνόστα 79; ἀναστάς redundant? 608.

ἀνοίγω augm. of 72; forms of 83; ἄν. τοῦς ὀφθαλμούς etc. 33; γλῶσσαν 622.

ἀνέμωσ 463.

-ανος ending of patronym. nouns 95.

ἀνταπόδομα 25.

ἀνταποκρίνισθαι 25.

ἀντί of price 206; with the gen. 364; constr. of verbs compounded with 429.

ἄντικρυς 42.

ἀντίλυτρον 25.

Ἄντίπας 103.

ἄντλημα 93.

ἀνώγειον or ἀνάγειον 43.

ἀνότερος 69.

ἀναμνησκειν constr. of 205, 226 sq.

ἀντιλέγειν 23.

ἄξιος, ἀξιοῦν constr. of 206.

ἀπάγωμαι 253.

ἀπαίδευτος 96.

ἀπαντῶ forms of 83.

ἀπάντησις 24.

ἀπαράβατος 25.

ἀπαρισμός 24.

ἀπειρωτος 97.

ἀπελπίζειν 24.

ἀπερίσπαστος 463.

ἀπέχω 275; ἀπέχεσθαι constr. of 427.

ἀπό in alleged circumloc. for the gen. 193; with verbs of eating, taking etc. 199; with verbs of fulness 201; meaning of etc. 364 sq. 369 sq.; distinguished from ἐκ 364; distinguished from ἐπὶ 369; distinguished from παρά with passives 370; with verbs of receiving etc. 370; constr. of verbs compounded with 427 sq.; trajectory of with the gen. of place? 557; ἀπὸ ἔνωθεν 603; ἀπ' ἔρτι 422; ἀπὸ πέρυσι 422; ἀπὸ πρῶτ' 422; ἀπὸ τότε 422; ἀπὸ μακρόθεν 603; ἀπὸ μέρους 423; ἀπὸ μᾶς 423, 591; ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἔως μεγάλου 18.

ἀποβλέπειν eis 622.

ἀπογράφεσθαι 254.

ἀποδίδομαι 253.

ἀποθήσκειν constr. of 210, 226, 227, 428.

ἀποκαθίστημι augm. of 72.

ἀποκεφαλίζειν 25.

ἀποκρίνομαι 23, 253, 261.

ἀποκτείνω forms of 83; signif. of 253.

ἀποκτεῖ and ἀποκτεῖ 88.

ἀπολέσω 83.

ἀπολαμβάνειν constr. of 428.

ἀπόλλυμι forms of 83.

Ἀπολλῶς 62, 102.

ἀπολύομαι 253.

ἀποπίπτειν constr. of 427.

ἀποβρίπτειν 251.

ἀποστασία 24.

ἀποστέλλειν 594.

ἀποστερεύσθαι with gen. 196; signif. of 254.

ἀποτίσσεσθαι 23.

- ἀποτόμως 463.
 ἄπταιστος 97.
 ἀπόσατο 90.
 ἄρα meaning and use of 444 sq.; before
 apod. 541, 548; position of 558; ἄρα
 εὖν 445, 558.
 ἄρα intempest. 538.
 ἀργός, -η, -ον, 24, 68.
 ἀργύρια 176.
 ἀρίσκειν constr. of 233.
 ἀρεσκία accent 51.
 τὰ ἀριστερά 176.
 ἀρκέσθαι constr. of 232.
 ἀρνεῖσθαι 259.
 ἀροτριᾶν 24.
 ἀρπάζω forms of 83.
 ἄρσαν 66.
 ἄρσην 22.
 Ἄρτεμις 182.
 Ἄρτεμιον inflec. 64.
 ἄρτεν φαγεῖν 33.
 ἀρχή without art. 124; τὴν ἀρχήν altogether
 464.
 -αρχος 61.
 -αρχος 61 sq.
 ἄρχομαι constr. of 846; alleged pleonasm
 of 612 sq.; peculiar use of 633.
 Ἄσια art. with 112.
 ἀσπάζομαι 289, 290.
 ἀστέρας 96.
 ἀστοχεῖν with gen. 196.
 ἀσφαλῆν 66, 69.
 ἀσφαλίζεσθαι τοὺς πόδας εἰς οἶκ. 632.
 ἀσπνίζειν 24, 100.
 ἀτιμάζεσθαι 252, 263.
 αἰθεντεῖν 23.
 αἰδέω forms of 83, 251.
 αἶρα ellipsis of 591.
 αὐτοκατάκριτος 236.
 αὐτός in loose reference 145 sq. 632; sub-
 joined to the subject 147 sq. 519; sub-
 joined to the relative 148; repeated 149;
 καὶ αὐτός for δὲ 149; unemphatic? 150;
 δ αὐτός 112; with dat. 150; αὐτὸς ἐγὼ
 153; αὐτοῦ or αὐτοῦ? 151 sq.; αὐτοῦ
 before the governing subst. 155; in
 apposition 530; αὐτὸ τοῦτο αὐτ. 142.
 ἀφειδρὼν 95.
 ἀφίδω 45.
 ἀφίημι, ἀφίω, ἀφίω 81.
 ἀφιστάμαι constr. of 427.
 ἀφορᾶν εἰς 322.
 ἀφικνέω 26.
 Ἀχαῖα art. with 112.
 ἀχειροποίητος 236.
 ἄχρι or ἄχρις? 42; constr. of 297, 471.
 Βάβα, ἡ 172.
 βαβύς 22.
 βαίνω forms of 79.
 βαλάντιον ἐκπν of 48.
 βάλλω 251 sq.
 βαπτίζω constr. of 216, 217, 412; mid. 254,
 255, 621; βαπτ. πρὸς τὸ πλ. 622.
 βαπτισμα 25, 35, 98.
 βαπτισμός 621.
 βαρεῖν 24; forms of 83.
 βασανίσαιν εὐαριστ. of 280, 206.
 βασίλισσα 24, 25.
 βασκανώ forms of 83; constr. of 233.
 βάτος, ἡ 36; δ 63.
 βεβαία 69.
 βεμβρόνας 22.
 Βηθαβαρά decl. 61.
 Βηθσαϊδά indecl. 61.
 Βηθθαγῇ 52; indecl. 61.
 βιβλαρίδιον 24, 96.
 βίδω forms of 84; χρόνον 226.
 βλέπτειν constr. of 227.
 βλαστάνω forms of 84; 251.
 βλασφημεῖν constr. of 222, 629.
 βλέπειν ἀπὸ 39; τι 222; εἰς 232.
 βοᾶν constr. of 212.
 βόσκεσθαι 252.
 βουλεύεσθαι 254.
 βούλομαι aug. of 70; ἐβούλετο without
 ἔν 283.
 βουνός 22.
 βραδυτής 52 sq.
 βρέχειν 23.
 Γαλιλαία art. with 112.
 γαμέω forms of 84; mid. 254.
 γαμίσκω 92.
 γάμοι 176.
 γάρ origin and signification of 445 sq.; in
 explanations 446, and going before
 447; in rejoinders 446; in questions
 447; repeated 447 sq.; not to be taken
 for but 453; nor for therefore 454; nor
 for although 454; nor for on the contrary
 454; nor for nevertheless 454; nor as
 a mere copula 454; sometimes equiv.
 to δέ 452, 456; position of 558; in-
 troducing parenth. 562.

ἔσθληται or ἔσθ 52.

γέλωτ forms of 84.

γίνει and τῷ γίνει 120.

γενέσια 24, 176.

γεννήματα 28, 25.

γενέσθαι constr. of 36, 198; γενέσθαι 33.

γῆ without art. 120; ellipsis of 592.

γηράσκω 92.

γῆραι dat. 64.

γίγνομαι forms of 84; construed with εἰς 183 sq.; with gen. 196 sq.; with dat. 210 sq.; ἡγνεντο with acc. and inf. 323; never used periphrastically 350; with

pred. adj. 515; ellipsis of 586; καὶ

ἡγνεντο pleonastically 608.

γινώσκω signific. 263; ἔνθεα 18.

γλῶσσαι 32; ellipsis of 501; γλωσσῶν λα-

λῶν 594.

γλωσσόκομον 24, 34.

γῆσιος inflec. 69.

γιογύζω 22.

γόνυ περὶ τινά 210.

Γολγοθᾶ indecl. 61.

τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα 177.

αἱ γραφαὶ 177.

γράφω in the preterite 278.

γρηγορῶ 26, 92.

γυμνήτεται 26.

γυναικείον 96.

γυνή ellipsis of 190.

δαίμων, δαιμόνια 23, 239.

δαυῖδ spelling of 44.

δέ meaning and use of 441, 443; distinguished from ἀλλά 441 sq.; μὲν ... δέ 441, 443; οὐ (μή) ... δέ 442; οὐτω ... δέ 442; καὶ ... δέ 443; δέ ... καὶ 443; never means *therefore* 452; nor *for* 452; nor is it a mere particle of transition 453; as related to γὰρ 456; after a single neg. 495, 539 sq.; position of 558; introducing parenth. 562.

δερματίζειν 25, 26.

δείπνος, δ 65.

δεκατὺν 24.

δεξιᾷ without art. 122; τὰ δεξιὰ 176.

δεξιολαβεῖν 102.

δεξιόδαρος 101.

δέομαι constr. of 198.

δερμάτινος 26.

δεσμός plur. forms of 63.

δεύτερον 250.

δευτέρωπατος 100.

δή with imperat. 313.

Δημῶς 103.

διδ with gen. 377 sq. 423 sq.; with verbs of praising etc. 378; denoting the *causes principales*? 378; used of time 380; with acc. 398 sq.; in circumlocutions 423; construction of verbs compounded with 431.

διεβεβαίω 253.

διδόλος without art. 124.

διήγειν sc. τὸν βίον 503.

διὰ ἡκαὶ 177.

διὰ ἡκαὶ διατίθεσθαι 225.

διὰ ἡκαὶ 593.

διαλλάσσειν constr. of 206.

διαπατριβή 102.

διαπλεῖν with acc. 431.

διαπορεύεσθαι 23.

διαπορεύεσθαι constr. of 431.

διασκορπίζειν 25.

διατρίβειν sc. τὸν χρόνον 503.

διδάσκειν τινί 223; ἐν 227.

δίδωμι forms of 78, 79, 84; constr. of 100, 197, 198.

διεγείρειν 102.

διέρχεσθαι with acc. and with δέ 431.

δικαιοκρισία 25, 99.

δικαίος ἐκ πίστεως 136.

δικαιοσύνη 32; etc. 35; without art. 120; θεῷ 186; πίστει 186.

δέ 445.

δέ 445.

διυρύνειν 594.

διφῶν etc. 17, 77; with acc. 204 sq.

δίδωμι 30; forms of 84.

διᾶξω 84.

δοκεῖν alleged pleonasm of 612 sq.

δολεῖν 26.

δόξαι ellipsis of 592.

δόξα 32; ἡ 106.

δραχμή ellipsis of 592.

δύναμαι aug. of 70; forms of 76, 84; with infin. 321, 327, 333; used absolutely 590, 594; alleged pleonasm of 613.

δυνάμεις 32.

δυναμός 26.

δύνη 76.

δύο inflec. 64; with plur. 177; δύο δύο 249.

δοσι 64.

δοσμαι 176.

δύω, δύνω forms of 84.

δωδεκάφυλος 100.

δῶη 78.

δῶμα 23.

δωρεάν 230.

δῶσθ 79.

ἐάν sometimes ἄν, never ἤν 291; constr. of 291, 293, 294 sq.; ἐάν . . . εἰ 296; for ἄν after relatives 310; ἐάν μή in oaths 500; position of 550; supposed ellipsis of 541, 595.

ἐαυτοῦ 150; ἐαυτῶν and ἐαυτῷ with the mid. 257.

ἐγάμησα 84.

ἐγγύς constr. of 195, 471; ἐγγυς εἶναι 465.

ἐγείρομαι 252.

ἐγενήθην 84.

ἐγκαίνια 176.

ἐγκαινίζειν 33.

ἐγκαλεῖν constr. of 203, 431.

ἐγκεντρίζειν constr. of 430.

ἐγκρατέομαι 25.

ἐγραψα equiv. to γράφω 278.

ἐγώ never unemphatic 152 sq.

ἔδει a real imperf. indic. 283.

ἐδῶκαμεν 84.

ἐθελοθρησκεία 100.

ἐθνικῶς 463.

ἐθίθη 44.

-ει in 2d pers. sing. pass. for η 75 sq.

εἰ with subjunc. 36; constr. of 291 sq.; and ἐάν distinguished 295, 296; with ind. fut. 300; for ἐπεὶ 448; denoting a wish 448; in oaths 500; supposed ellipsis of 595; in direct quest. 508, 509; apparently for ὅτι 542; εἰ ἤρα 445; εἰ δὲ μή γε 583, 605; εἰ καὶ distinguished from καὶ εἰ 444; εἰ μή 478 sq. 633, rule for use of 479, not used affirm. 500; εἰ οὐ 478 sq., rule for use of 479.

-εια etc. in 1st aor. opt. 76.

εἴγε 448.

εἶδέα 48.

εἶδω κνoui, forms of 84; perf. 274.

εἶδωλολάτρης 100.

εἶδωλολατρεία 26.

εἶδωλόθυτον 26, 100.

εἰλίσσειν 22.

εἰμί forms of 79; with part. in periphrasis 348 sq.; with advbs. 465; omission of 584; with εἰς 183 sq.; with gen.

195 sq.; with dat. 210; with pred. adj. 515; ἐστί with infin. 320.

-εως adjectives in 99.

εἰπεῖν forms of 85; fut. 279, 280; εἴρηκε sc. ὁ θεός 522; ἔφη in direct discourse 558; ellipsis of 598; εἰπών 22, accent 51.

εἴπερ 448.

εἴπως with ind. fut. 300.

εἰρήνη θεοῦ 186.

-εις plural ending 64.

εἰς never ἐς 52; in supposed circumlocution for the nom. 183; as a sign of the dat. ? 212; of the acc. ? 228, 527; in circumlocutions 228, 424, 527; with infin. how rendered 329; with acc. 396 sq.; used for ἐν ? 414; with ἵζειν, καθί(ζε)σθαι etc. 415; εἰς τρίς 422; constr. of verbs compounded with 430.

εἰς and ὁ εἰς 116; εἰς as an indef. art. (τις) ? 117; for πρῶτος 32, 248; εἰς καθ' εἰς 249; εἰς . . . οὐ 172; εἰς . . . καὶ εἰς 173; position of 548.

εἰσερχεσθαι constr. of 427; εἰς τὸν κόσμον 18.

εἶσω, ἔσω 52.

εἴτε 540; before apod. 541.

εἴτε . . . εἴτε 440.

ἐκ in circumlocutions 193, 424; use of with gen. 366 sq.; distinguished from ἀπὸ 364; with verbs of fulness 201; never put for ἐν 368; constr. of verbs compounded with 429; in local attraction 629.

ἐκαστος always without art. 111; with plur. pred. 516.

ἐκατόνταρχος 61.

ἐκβάλλειν ἔξω 603.

ἐκγαμίζειν 102.

ἐκεῖ for ἐκεῖσε 471.

ἐκεῖνος with noun and art. 110; referring to the nearest subject 157; position of 157, 162; repeated 160.

ἐκεῖσε for ἐκεῖ 472.

ἐκέρθησα 87.

ἐκκαεῖν 25.

ἐκκλησία without art. 122.

ἐκλέγεσθαι ἔν τινι 226.

οἱ ἐκλεκτοί 35, 234.

ἐκμυκτηρίζειν 25.

ἐκπαλαί 24, 422.

ἐκπίπτειν constr. of 427.

ἐκπλήσσεσθαι constr. of 232.

- ἑκραῖα 87.
 ἑκρυβον 88.
 ἐκτένεια 25.
 ἐκτενώς 25, 463.
 ἐκτός εἰ μή 605.
 ἐκτρέπειν 251, 429.
 ἐκχέω forms of 85; ἐκχεῶ fut. 77.
 ἑκτρωμα 25.
 ἐκχύνειν 24.
 *Ἐλαιῶν or Ἐλαιῶν ? 182.
 ἐλάκησα 88.
 ἐλαχιστότερος 69.
 ἐλεάω 85.
 ἐλεεινός 99.
 ἐλεέω forms of 85; constr. of 233.
 ἑλεος gend. 66.
 ἐλευθεροῦν constr. of 196, 197.
 ἐλεύσομαι 86.
 ἑλκω forms of 86.
 ἐλληνίζειν, ἐλληνιστής 28, 94.
 ἐλπίζειν constr. of 233, 321, 331, 410.
 ἐμός used objectively 153.
 ἐμπορεύεσθαι constr. of 222, 429.
 ἔμπροσθεν 471.
 ἐν and *Beth essentialis* 184, 513; hebraistically for acc. of object ? 226; in alleged circumloc. for gen. 193; alleged sign of the dat. 217; ἐν Χριστῷ 359, 360, 388, 390; with dat. in local use 384; temporal 385; fig. uses 386 sq.; apparently with gen. 384; ἐν φ, ἐν ταύτῃ 387; distinguished from διὰ 389; ἐν δυνάμει 390; used for εἰς ? 413 sq. 415; originally identical with εἰς 416; in adverbial and other circumlocutions 424; construction of verbs compounded with 429.
 ἔνατος 43.
 ἐνδύσασθαι Χριστόν 30.
 ἐνεγκας 90.
 ἐνεκα forms of 43; with infin. 329.
 ἐνέπαιξα 88.
 ἐνεργεῖν 258, 430.
 ἐνέχειν sc. χρόνον ? 593.
 ἐνι 80, 423.
 ἐννεήκοντα 43.
 ἐννεός or ἐνεός 44.
 ἐνοχος constr. of 180, 202, 210, 213.
 ἐνταλμα 25.
 ἐντεῦθεν looking forwards 161.
 ἐντρέπεσθαι constr. of 221, 429.
 ἐντρυφᾶν constr. of 430.
 ἐνῶπιον 214; τοῦ θεοῦ 32.
 ἐνωτίζεσθαι 33.
 ἐξαγεῖν ἕξω 603.
 ἐξανατέλλειν 102.
 ἐξάπινα 24.
 ἐξαστράπτειν 102.
 ἐξεκρέμετο 87.
 ἐξένευσε 91.
 ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς δοφύος τινός 33.
 ἐξ οὗ whence 141 sq.
 ἐξομολογείσθαι 102; constr. of 30, 32, 209.
 ἐξὸν εἶναι 24.
 ἐξορκίζειν 102.
 ἐξουθενῶ 26.
 ἐξουθενεῖν 25.
 ἐξυπνίζειν 24.
 ἕξω 471.
 ἐξῶσεν 90.
 ἕοικα 274.
 ἐπαγγελίαι 177.
 ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι with infin. 331.
 ἐπαινέσω 86.
 ἐπαινέω forms of 86; constr. of 203.
 ἐπαιξα 88.
 ἐπαισχύνομαι augm. of 73; constr. of 221.
 ἐπᾶν 297.
 ἐπᾶνω 102, 250.
 Ἐπαφῶς 103.
 ἐπεὶ 448; with indic. pres. 283.
 ἐπεὶ ἕρα 445.
 ἐπειδὴ 448.
 ἐπειδήπερ 448.
 ἐπεὶ μή 480.
 ἐπεὶ περ 448.
 ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο 603.
 ἐπέκεινα accent 52.
 ἐπεκτείνεσθαι constr. of 431.
 ἐπεμψα equiv. to πέμπω 278.
 ἐπενδύτης 25.
 ἐπέχειν 593.
 ἐπηρεάζειν constr. of 221.
 ἐπὶ with gen. 374; with dat. 392; ἐφ' ᾧ 394; ἐπὶ τῷ δυνάμ. τινος 393; with acc. 407 sq.; with different cases in the same sentence 409; ἐπὶ τρις 422; in circumlocutions with gen. and dat. of abstracts 425; constr. of verbs compounded with 430.
 ἐπιγαμβρεύειν 26.
 ἐπιθυμεῖν constr. of 204, 430.
 ἐπικαλοῦμαι 253, 263, 430.
 ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι constr. of 202, 430 sq.

- ἐπιλησμονή 93.
 ἐπιορκέω forms of 86.
 ἐπιούσιος 97, 236.
 ἐπιποθεῖν constr. of 204, 430.
 ἐπιπόθητος 236.
 ἐπισκιάζειν constr. of 431.
 ἐπιστέλλειν 23.
 ἐπιστολαί of a single ep. 176.
 ἐπιστρέφεισθαι 26, 251.
 ἐπιστροφή 26.
 ἐπίταδε accent 52.
 ἐπιτιθέναι τινί sc. τὰς χεῖρας 593.
 ἐπιφᾶναι 89.
 ἐπιφαύσει 90.
 ἐπιφέρειν constr. of 431.
 ἐπιχειρεῖν pleonastic ? 613.
 ἐπουράνια, ἰδ. 235.
 ἐργάζομαι 72, 222, 259.
 ἔργον as a pleonasm ? 615.
 ἐρεύγεσθαι 23.
 ἔρημος accent 52; inflection 69; ἥ 106.
 ἐρίθεια, ἐριθεία 51, 94.
 ἔρις inflection 65.
 Ἑρμᾶς 103.
 ἐβλήθην, ἐβλήθην 85.
 ἔρχομαι forms of 86; ἔρχεται ὄρα, ἴνα 339;
 ὁ ἐρχόμενος 341.
 ἐρωτᾶν 22, 30, 32, 335.
 ἔσθις 23.
 ἐσθίω forms of 86; constr. of 180, 198 sq.
 ἔσθω 23, 86.
 ἐστάναι 78.
 ἔσχατος without art. 131.
 ἐσχάτως 463; ἔχειν 26.
 ἔσω not εἶσω 52; 471, 472.
 ἐσώτερος 69.
 ἕτερος in appos. 530; ἕτερος, ἐν 592.
 ἔτι in comparison 240; position of 553.
 ἔτοιμος accent 52; with aor. infin. 332.
 ἐτοίμως 463.
 εὐ augm. of verbs beginning with 71.
 εὐαγγελίζειν 24, 35; aug. of 71; constr. of
 180, 213, 223, 227, 229, 260.
 εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ 186.
 εὐαρέστως 463.
 εὐδοκεῖν 25, 101, 212, 222, 232.
 εὐθέως position of 554.
 εὐθύμως 463.
 εὐπερίστατος 236.
 εὐλογεῖν 32.
 εὐράμην 86.
 εὐρίσκω forms of 86; constr. of 219; εὐρί-
 σκεσθαι for εἶναι ? 616.
 εὐσχήμων 23.
 Εὐτυχος accent 51.
 εὐχαριστεῖν 23, 222.
 εὐχεσθαι aug. of 71; 212, 259.
 -εὔω verbs in 92.
 ἐφάπαξ 422
 ἔφη in direct disc. 558; omitted 598.
 ἔφθασα 90.
 ἐφιδε 45.
 ἐφιστάναι constr. of 427.
 ἐχθές 24, 45; cf. 48.
 ἔχω with gen. 202; with infin. 333; ὡ
 γαστρὶ ἔχ. 594; μὴ ἔχειν 594.
 -έω verbs in with ε in the fut. 77.
 ἐωνησάμην 79.
 ἔως and ἕως οὐ constr. 296; ἕως ἄν 308;
 ἕως as a prep. 470; ἕως ἔρτι, πότε etc.
 471.
 ζάω forms of 86; constr. of 226, 227.
 ζῆλος, τοῦ 65.
 Ζηνᾶς 102.
 ζήσω 86.
 ζῆτεῖν ψυχὴν 33.
 ζῶη αἰώνιος 133.
 ἥ in comparisons 240 sq.; ἥ ... καὶ 440;
 never for καὶ 440, yet cf. 441; co-
 ordinate with οὔτε 491 sq.; after neg.
 508; in questions 509; repeated 519;
 supposed ellipsis of 595 sq.
 ἡγέομαι ὡς 602.
 ἡγησις 24.
 ἡκα 87.
 ἡκω 87, 274.
 ἡλιος anarthrous 119 sq.
 ἡμάρτησα 82.
 ἡμεθα 80.
 ἡμεῖς never unemphatic 153.
 ἡμελλε 70.
 ἡμέρα ellipsis of 590; ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμέρας 463.
 ἡμίση, -α, -εια 65.
 ἡμῶν inflection 64.
 ἡνίκα constr. of 296; ἡνίκα ἄν 297.
 ἦξα 87.
 ἡρεμος 70.
 -ηριον substantives in 96.
 ἡρχόμην 86.
 Ἡρωδιανός 95.
 ἦς for ἦσθα 80.
 ἦτοι ... ἦ 440.
 ἡττάομαι 260.
 ἦτω 79.

ἡφιε 81.

ἡχος, τό 65.

θάλασσα without art. 121.

θάλλω 87.

θάμβος, gen. θάμβου 66.

θανατηφόρος 101.

θάνατος 29; without art. 122.

θαυμάζειν constr. of 232.

θεάομαι 259.

θεατρίζειν 25, 26.

θεόπνευστος 96.

θέλω with inf. 37, 321, 327, 333; θέλω *η* malle 241; not for θέλων 284; followed by subjunc. 285, 595; *ἵνα* 336 sq.; used adverbially? 467; pleonastic? 612 sq.

θεός, θεέ vocative 63; without art. 121 sq.; ellipsis of 522, 588.

θεοστυγής 23; accent 53.

Θευδᾶς 103.

θλίψις, θλίψις 50.

θρήσκος accent 50.

θριαμβεύειν 23, 251.

θυμὸς ἀργής 611.

θύρα without art. 123; in plur. 176.

θυρεός 23.

-θω verbs in 92.

-ια nouns in 95.

ἰδομαι 259.

ἰδέ and ἴδε 49.

ἴδιος for poss. pron. 153 sq.; added to a pers. pron. 154; position of 548; ἰδίᾳ, κατ' ἰδίαν 591; τὰ ἴδια 592.

ἱερίσσα 24.

ἱερίχῳ 67.

ἱεροσύλημα 25.

ἱεουργεῖν constr. of 222.

ἱεροσολήμ form and inflec. 67 sq.; use of art. with 112; plur. 176.

-ίζω fut. of verbs in 75; deriv. of verbs in 91 sq.

ἱημι forms of 80.

ἱησοῦς inflection 66.

ἱκεσία 24.

ἰδωσκεσθαι constr. of 227.

ἰλαστήριον 96, 592.

ἰλεως 22.

ἰμάτια 176; ellipsis of 591.

ἰματίζω 26.

ἰμείρεσθαι 101; constr. of 204.

ἵνα 449; with ind. pres. 36; constr. of 287 sq.; with subjunc. for imperat. 315;

weakened 86, and for infin. 334 sqq.; John's use of 338 sq. 461; is it used ἐκβατικῶς? 457 sq.; *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* 461; apparently for ὥστε or ὡς after adj. 461; for ἔτι? 462; supposed ellipsis of 285, 595; in breviloquence 620, ἀλλ' *ἵνα* 620; *ἵνα* τί *wherefore* 169, sc. γέν. 586.

-ινος adjectives in 99.

Ἰορδάνης art. with 112.

Ἰούδα use of art. with 114.

Ἰουδαία art. with 112.

ἵσα used adverbially 177.

ἰσάγγελος 236.

ἴσος accent 52; *ἵσα* adv. 177; constr. of 209.

ἰσάνω 87.

ἰσάω 78.

ἴστημι forms of 78, 79, 87; signif. of 252; perf. 274.

Ἰταλία art. with 112.

Ἰωσῆς inflection 66.

καθάπτω 257.

καθαρίζειν constr. of 197.

καθαρός constr. of 197.

καθ' εἰς 249.

κάθῃ 81.

κάδῃμαι forms of 81; constr. of 431.

καθημερινός 26.

καθίζειν constr. of 415, 431.

κάθου 81.

καθώς 26; καθὼς . . . οὕτως 440.

καί 434 sqq.; connecting numerals 250; connecting diff. tenses 280; at the beginning of an apodosis 286, 438; connecting imperatives 311; distinguished from τε 434; uses of 435 sq.; with interrogatives 437; adversative 437; exegetical 437; meaning especially? 438; after a particle of time 438; καί . . . καί 439; in comparisons 440, 603; never for ἤ 440; καί . . . δέ 443; καί εἰ distinguished from εἰ καί 444; καί γάρ 448; καί οὐ, καί μή 493; in schema κατ' ἐξοχήν 520 sq. 539 sq.; transposed? 560; introducing parenth. 562; anacoluthic use of one for two 576; καί ἐγένετο Hebraistically 608.

καιρός without art. 124.

Καισάρεια art. with 112.

καίτοι, καίπερ with part. 344; καίτοιγε 444.

κακία without art. 120.

καλεῖν, ἐπὶ τινα 410, 593; καλεῖσθαι for εἶναι? 615; καλέσω fut. 77.
καλοποιεῖν 25, 26; constr. of 222.
καμμύνειν 24.
κῶν vel certe 584.
Κανᾶ accent 52; indecl. 61.
καρδοκεῖν 101.
καρδία as a circumlocution for the pers. pron. 156; εὐθεῖα 32.
καρπὸς κοιλίας 33; ὁσφύος 33; χειλέων 33.
κατὰ with acc. of pers. pron. equiv. to poss. pron. 154; in circum. for gen. 193; with gen. 381 sq.; with acc. 400 sq.; in local sense 400; in temporal 401; in distributive 401; figuratively 401 sq.; καθ' αὐτόν 401; in circumlocutions 425; καθ' ὅλου 425; constr. of verbs compounded with 431.
κατάρβα 79.
κατέγνυμι aug. of 70.
κατακαθήσεται 87.
κατακαίω 87.
κατακαυχᾶσθαι constr. of 203, 432.
κατακρίνειν constr. of 210.
καταλαμβάνω 253.
καταλείπω 87.
καταλιθάζειν 102.
κατάλυμα 25, 93.
κατάνυξις 94.
καταποτίζειν 24.
καταστολή 23.
κατεαγῶ 70.
κατέαζαν 70.
κατείδωλος 236.
κατέναντι 102.
κατενόπτιον 102.
κατέχειν eis 594.
κατηγορεῖν constr. of 180, 203, 260, 431.
κατόρθωμα 25.
κατώτερος 69.
καυχᾶσθαι constr. of 222, 233.
κείρειν 257.
κεκέρασμαι 87.
κέκτημαι 274.
κελεύειν with infin. 332, 336.
eis κενόν 592; κενῶς 463.
κεραμικός 99.
κεράννυμι 87.
κεφαλῆς 23.
κέρας inflection 65.
κερδαῖνος 87.
κῆρυξ or κῆρυξ? 50.
κινέομαι 252.

κλαίω 87; constr. of 222.
κλᾶν τὸν ἕρπον 35.
κλαύσω 87.
κλείς inflection 65.
κλείειν τι ἀπὸ τινος 622.
Κλεόπας 103.
κλέπτω 87.
κλέψω 87.
κληρονομεῖν constr. of 200.
οἱ κλητοὶ 35.
κλίβανος 22.
κλίμα acc. 50.
κλινάριον 96.
ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός 33.
κοιμᾶσθαι 267; perf. 274.
κοινωνεῖν constr. of 200.
κολλυβιστής 94.
Κολοσσαῖ spelling 44.
κόλποι 176.
κοράσιον 24.
κόσμος inflection 68.
κόσμος 26; without art. 123.
κράββατος 25, 43.
κράζω 87, 274; 3d fut. pass. 279.
κράξω 87.
κρατεῖν constr. of 202.
κρέας inflection 65.
κρέμαμαι 87.
κρίμα accent 50.
κρούειν 593.
κρούτω 88; constr. of 227; mid. 253; τι ἀπὸ τινος 622.
κτδόμαι 260; perf. 274.
κτίσις 32; without art. 123.
κτιστῇ, κτίσῃ 51.
κτίστης accent 51, 94; without art. 122.
κυριακός 236.
κύριος κυρίων 18; without art. 124.
κύω and κύτω 88.
κωλύειν with gen. 196.
Κῶς, Κῶ 62.
λαβέ, λάβε 49.
λαβόν pleonastic? 607.
λαγχάνειν constr. of 200.
λάβρα 47.
λαίλαψ not λαίλαψ 50.
λαλιά 23.
λαλεῖν γλωσσᾶς 594.
λαμβάνειν constr. of 202; τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν 237.
λαμπάς 23.
λάσκω 88.

λατρεύειν 593.

λέγειν constr. of 212; ellipsis of 587; λέγει sc. ὁ θεός 522, 588; λέγων used absol. 535 sq.; pleonastically 602.

Λευτ or Λευί inflection 66.

λιθοβολεῖν 25, 26, 102.

λιμός, ἡ, 22, 36, 63.

λογία 25.

λογίζεσθαι eis 228.

λογίζομαι 259; ὥς 602.

λοιβή 23.

λοιπόν, τό 592.

λουεῖν ἀπὸ 197; λούεσθαι 253.

Λουκᾶς 103.

λυχνία 24.

Λύδδα inflection 61.

λύειν 32; constr. of 197.

λυτροῦν constr. of 197; act. and mid. 253.

-μα substantives in 25, 93.

μαθητεύειν 23; constr. of 221, 251.

Μακεδονία art. with 112.

μακράν 230.

μακρόθεν 463.

μᾶλλον in comparison 240, 603; πολλὸν μᾶλλον 633.

μάμμη 25.

Μανασσῇ inflection 67.

μαρθάνειν with infin. and part. 347.

μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν 225.

μάταιος inflection 68.

μάτην 230.

μαχαίρης 62.

μεγαλύνειν 30.

μεγαλωσύνη 26.

μεθύσκεσθαι constr. of 201, 217, 252.

μέθυσος 23.

μειζότερος 27, 69.

μέλει constr. of 205.

μελίσσιος 24.

μέλλειν with inf. 37, 334; aug. of 70.

μεμαμμένον 88.

μέν 443; position of 558, 559; without δέ 575 sq.; μὲν ... ἀλλὰ 443; μὲν ... δέ 540; μὲν ... ἔπειτα 576; μὲν ... καὶ 576.

μενούργε 558.

μέντοι 444, 558, 559.

μεσημβρία without art. 121.

μεσιτεύειν 25.

μέσον without art. 123, 131; μέσον as an adv. 471.

μετὰ with gen. 376; distinguished from σύν

391; with acc. 403; constr. of verbs compounded with 432; μετὰ τοῦτο or ταῦτα 540.

μετανοεῖν ἀπὸ or ἐκ 622.

μεταξύ, ἐν τῷ 592.

μετασταθῆναι with gen. 196.

μετέχω constr. of 180, 201.

μετοικεσία 24.

μετρεῖν ἐν 218.

μετριοπαθεῖν 101.

μέχρι and μέχρις 471.

μή etc. distinguished from οὐ 473 sq.; use of 476 sqq.; with imperat. 476; in conditional clauses 477 sq.; in relative clauses 480 sq.; with infin. 481; with participles 482 sq.; apparently for οὐ 486 sq.; in continued negation 487 sq.; in anthith. 495 sq.; in independ. prop. 500 sq.; in prohibitions 502; in depend. prop. 502 sq.; after δρα, βλέπε etc. 503, 601; after verbs of fearing 505; in questions 511; ellipsis with 596; redundant 604; in εἰ μή 633; in ἐκτός εἰ μή 605; in εἰ δὲ μή γε 605; μή ... ἀλλὰ 595; μή ... ἀλλὰ καὶ 498; μή οὐ 511; μή ... πᾶς for μηδεῖς 171.

μηδέ 487 sqq.; must be preceded by μή 489; distinguished from καὶ μή 493; μηδὲ ... μήτε 492.

μηθέν 44.

μηκέτι supposed use of for μή 618.

μήν 434, 443.

μήποτε 480.

μήπως with indic. pret. 504 sq.; with both indic. and subjunc. 505.

μήτε 487 sqq.; used after μηδέ? 492.

μήτηρ without art. 122; omitted 190.

μυαίνω 88.

μυμήσκεσθαι with gen. or acc. 180, 628.

μισθαποδοσία 24.

μισθωτός 51.

μνημονεύειν constr. of 205.

μοιχαλῖς 24.

-μονή substantives in 93.

μονόφθαλμος 24.

μόνος without art. 131; supposed ellipsis of 495, 595.

-μος substantives in 93.

μοσχοποιεῖν 26.

μυκτηρίζω ἐν 629.

μύριοι, μυρία 53.

μῶρος accent 52.

Μωυσῆς spelling 44; inflection 66.

ρ in the accusative 66.

ν ἐφέλκυστιν 41.

νεκροί without art. 123.

νηπιόζω 92.

νίκος 24.

νίπτω 88.

νοί, νοός 62.

νομοθετεῖν 261.

νόμος without art. 123.

νοσσιδ 24.

νοσσοί 24.

νουθεσία 24.

νοῦς inflection 62.

Νυμφᾶς 102.

νύμφη 32.

νυνί 23; with imperat. 313.

νυχθήμερον 25.

νῶτος δ and τδ 63.

ξενίεσθαι constr. of 209.

ξενοδοχεύς 25.

ξηρά, ἡ 18, 592.

ξύλον 23.

ξύρα 24.

δ with participle derisively 135; with an acc. elliptically 589; δ μὲν ... δ δέ 104; δ δέ without δ μὲν 104; δ ἂν κ. δ ἦν κ. δ ἐρχόμενος 68.

δ for δι' δ 142; before a clause 168.

δε apparently equiv. to δ δεῖνα 162.

δδός 32; ellipsis of 590; δδὸν θαλάσσης 231.

οικοδοσκοτεῖν 25.

οικοδοσπότης 25.

οικοδομεῖν 30; augm. of 71; pass. 263;

οἶκον 603.

οικοδομή 24, etc. 35.

οικτεῖρω 88.

οικτιρμοί 176.

ὀλίγος without art. 131.

ὀλοθρεῖν, ὀλεθρεῖν 92.

ὀλοκαύτωμα 33.

ὀλόκληρος 25.

ὄλος without art. 131.

Ὀλυμπᾶς 103.

ὀμείρεσθαι or ὀμείρεσθαι 101.

ὀμλεῖν constr. of 212.

ὀμνύω 88; constr. of 222.

ὀμοιάζειν 25.

ὀμοῖος accent 52; inflec. 68; constr. of 180, 195, 209.

ὀμοῖον ἔς 602.

ὀμολογεῖν constr. of 39, 209, 226.

ὀμολογία 35.

ὀμως 334, 444; transposed 553.

ὀνειδίζειν with the acc. 222.

ὀνειδισμός 24.

ὄνομα as an alleged pleonasm 615; ἐν

ὀνόματι τινος 390; ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ. 394.

ὀνομάζεσθαι not esse 615 sq.

ὀπισθεν 471.

ὀπίσω 471.

ὀποίος 543.

ὀπόσος 543.

ὀπου for ὅποι 471, 472; 510.

ὀπτασία 24.

ὀπως constr. of 287 sq. 542; with ἂν 309 sq.;

ὅρα δπ. 338; meaning and use 449;

ὀπως πληρωθῇ 461; not equiv. to ὥστε

462; in Indirect quest. 510; supposed ellipsis of 285, 595.

ὀρᾶν 88; perf. in sense of pres. 274.

ὀργή, ἡ sc. τοῦ θεοῦ 594.

ὀργίεσθαι constr. of 232.

ὀργεσθαι 252.

ἡ ὀρεινὴ 591.

ὀρέων 64.

ὀρθοποδεῖν 26, 102.

ὀρθοτομεῖν 26.

ὀρθρίζω 26, 33.

ὀρθρινός 25.

ὀρκον οἱ ὀρκῶ 226, 603; εἰς 397.

ὀρκωμοσία, ἡ 24.

ὀροθεσία 25.

ὅς supposed remote reference of 157 sq.;

for interrog. 167; position of clause

with 167 sq.; for demons. 168; before

a clause 168; ὅς ἂν with the moods

306 sq.; ὅς μὲν ... ὅς δέ 105; ὅ for δι'

δ 142.

ὀσάκεις ἂν 297, 308.

-οσαν in 3d plur. hist. tenses 77.

ὅσον ὅσον 247.

ὀστέα, ὀστέων 63.

ὅστις occurs in N. T. only in nom. 163;

ὅστις ἂν 306, 480, 543.

ὀστράκινος 26.

-οστήν substantives in 95.

ὅταν with indic. 36; with the moods 297,

308, 309.

ὅτε with the indic. 296; with the subjunc.

298; confounded with ὅτι 457; ὁπότε

constr. of 296.

ὅτι with infin. 339, 573; meaning and use

of 445, 449; not equiv. to διό 456,

- nor διὰ τί 456, nor *quantum* 457, nor ὅτε 457, nor *perfecto* 457, nor ὅς 457; 542; pleonastic ? 597; before the orat. rect. 605; ὡς ὅτι 618.
- ἔ,τι mode of writing 46; as interrog. in N. T. 167, 168.
- οὐ etc. distinguished from μή 473 sqq.; combining with verbs 476; with nouns 476; in conditional sentences (εἰ οὐ) 477; after ὅτι and ἐπεὶ because 480; in relative clauses 480 sq.; with participles 485; in continued negation 488sq.; οὐ ... ὅτε 490; in arith. (οὐ ... ἀλλὰ) 495, 497; οὐ ... ἀλλὰ καὶ 498; οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλὰ 498; with fut. ind. 315, 501; οὐ μή 505 sq.; Dawes's rule 507; with pres. indic. 507; in questions 510 sq.; οὐκ ἔρα 511; οὐ μή disting. from μή οὐ 511 sq.; οὐ πάντως and πάντως οὐ 554; οὐ πάνυ 554; οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ 583 sq.; not for οὐπω 596; οὐχ ὅτι ... ἀλλὰ 597; οὐχ οἶον ὅτι 597; οὐ ... πᾶς 30, 171 sq.; οὐ πᾶς 171.
- οὐ no 476.
- οὐ *whilth* 471, 591.
- οὐαί, ἦ 179.
- οὐδέ without a preceding neg. 487; in continued negation 487; must be preceded by οὐ 489, 500; οὐδέ ... οὐδέ 489; after ὅτε 491; distinguished from καὶ οὐ 493, and from ὅτε 487, 494; οὐδέ ... δέ 495; οὐδέ *ne* ... *quidem* 500; οὐδέ μή 506, 539 sq.
- οὐδέ εἰς 173.
- οὐδέις ἔστιν ὅς with indic. 300.
- οὐθείς etc. 44.
- οὐκέτι supposed half pleonastic use of 618.
- οὐκουν and οὐκουν 512.
- οὐν uses of 444; allied to δέ 455; not equiv. to *but* 455; nor *for* 455; nor superfluous 455; as connective 539 sq.; before apod. ? 541, 542; position of 558.
- οὐράνιος inflection 68.
- οὐρανόθεν 463.
- οὐρανός without art. 121; οὐρανοί 176.
- ὅτε ... ὅτε 487 sq. 540; ὅτε ... ὅτε ... καὶ οὐ 489; ὅτε after οὐ 490; ὅτε ... ἦ 491; ὅτε after οὐδέ ? 492; diff. between and οὐδέ 494; ὅτε ... καὶ 494.
- ὅτος with a noun and art. 110; remote reference of 157; repetition of 159 sq.; looking forwards 161; in expressions of time 161; position of 162, 548; ταῦτα 162; ταῦτα πάντα 548.
- ὅτως and ὅτω 41; repeated 160; looking forwards 161; for οὕτως ? 465; before apod. 541; after condit. clauses 541; with part. 541; in anaphora 618.
- ὀφείλημα 32; ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι 30, 33.
- ὀφελον constr. of 301 sq.
- ὀφάριον 23.
- ὀφέ 471.
- ὀφῆσθε 88.
- ὀψιμος 24.
- ὀψώνιον 23; -ια 176.
- ω verbs in 91.
- παθητός 97.
- παιδάριον 96.
- παιδεύειν 22.
- παιδιόθεν 26, 463.
- παίζω 88.
- παῖς 30.
- πάλιν position of 548, 554; δεύτερον or ἐκ δευτέρου 604; ἔκθεον 604.
- πανδοχεύς 25.
- πανοικί 26, 44.
- πάντα ταῦτα and ταῦτα πάντα 548.
- πάντη, πάντῃ 47.
- πάντων with the compar. 242; with the superl. 248.
- πάντοτε 26.
- παρά in comparisons 240; distinguished from ἀπὸ 364 sq.; after passives 365; with gen. 365 sq.; with dat. 394; with acc. 403; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.
- παραβάτης 26.
- παραβολεύεσθαι 93.
- παραδιατριβή 102.
- παραδίδωσθαι absol. 35.
- παραθήκη, παρακαταθήκη 102.
- παραινέειν constr. of 223.
- παρακαλεῖν 22; with infin. 332; constr. with 335.
- παραλαμβάνειν εἰς 622.
- παραπλήσιον 471.
- παρασκευάζω 253.
- παραφρονία 24.
- παρεμβολή 22.
- παρέχειν, παρέχεσθαι 257.
- Παρμενᾶς 103.
- παῖρησις 23.
- πᾶς art. with 111; πᾶς ... οὐ (μή) 172; πάντα and πάντῃ 47; πάντα and τὰ

- πάντα 116; πάντων with the compar. 242; with the superl. 248; πάντα ταῦτα and ταῦτα πάντα 548; παντί, ἐν 592.
 πᾶσχα 68.
 πᾶσχειν 35, 594; constr. of 412.
 πατήρ without art. 122; ellipsis of 190.
 πατριάρχης 26.
 Παῦλος use of art. with 113.
 παύεσθαι with gen. 196, 262; παύομαι mid. 253, 263.
 παχύνειν 18.
 πείθειν ἵνα 338.
 πείθομαι 253.
 πειθός 24, 96.
 πεινῶν etc. 77; constr. of 204 sq.
 πεῖρᾶν 91.
 πεισμονή 93 sq.
 πέλαγος τῆς θαλάσσης 611.
 πελεκίζω 26.
 πέμπω in the preterite 278.
 πεντεκοστή 26.
 πεπειραμένος 91.
 πέποιθα constr. of 214, 233, 410.
 πεποιθήσις 25.
 πέρατα τῆς γῆς 30.
 περί in circumlocutions? 192 sq.; with gen. 372; distinguished from ὑπέρ 373, 411 sq.; with acc. 406; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.
 περιάγειν 257.
 περιέκειμαι constr. of 229.
 περιπατεῖν 32.
 περισπᾶσθαι 23.
 περισσοτέρως 70, 243.
 πετόμαι 24.
 πέτομαι 88.
 πηχῶν 65.
 πιάζω 22.
 πίεσαι 88.
 Πιλάτος accent 52; use of art. with 113.
 πίνω 88; fut. πίομαι 90.
 πίπτω 89.
 πιστεύειν constr. of 213, 229, 233, 260.
 πιστικός 97.
 πίστις etc. 35; without art. 120.
 πλατύνειν τὴν καρδίαν 30.
 πλεῖν with acc. 224.
 πλέον 596.
 πλεονεξία without art. 120.
 πληγή ellipsis of 589.
 πλῆν 508.
 πληροῦν, πληροῦσθαι 180, 201, 217, 260.
 πληροφωρία 25.
 πλησίον, ὁ 24, 130, 471.
 πλησμονή 94.
 πλοός 62.
 πλούσιος constr. of 201.
 πλούτος gen. 65; πλοῦτον πλουτεῖν 225.
 πνεῦμα etc. without art. 122; τὸ πνευματικόν 592.
 ποῖα 22.
 ποιεῖν, ποιῆσθαι 256; not pleonastic 609; ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετὰ τ. 33; ποιεῖν ἵνα 337.
 ποίμιον accent 52.
 πολεμεῖν μετὰ τ. 180, 214.
 πολιτεύεσθαι 262.
 πολλακίς position of 553.
 πολυμερῶς 463.
 πολὺς with other adj. 525, e.g. πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα and ἄλλα πολλὰ 525; πολλοὶ and οἱ πολλοὶ 110; πολὺ in comparison 240; πολὺ μᾶλλον 633; πλέον 596.
 πολυτρόπως 463.
 πορεύεσθαι ὁπίσω 30.
 πόρρω εἶναι 465.
 ποταπός 24.
 πότε for ὅποτε 510.
 πότηρον ... ἢ 509.
 ποτήριον 32.
 ποῦ 471, 508, 510.
 πούς accent 50.
 πρῶτος 47.
 πρᾶς, πρᾶτης 45.
 πρηνής 22.
 πρίν with subjunc. 297; with infin. 330, 332.
 πρό 372; with gen. of time 557; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.
 προβάλλειν 593.
 προβατική sc. πύλη 592.
 προβλέπειν, προβλέπεσθαι 258.
 προίχεσθαι 264.
 προκόπτειν 251.
 πρός for the simple dat.? 212, 214; with gen. 373; with dat. 395; with acc. 404 sq.; in circum. 425; verbs compounded with 432.
 προσέρχεσθαι constr. of 427, 432.
 προσέχειν τινί sc. τὸν νοῦν 593.
 προσήλυτος 24, 26, 97.
 προσκυνεῖν constr. of 36, 210, 593.
 προστίθμι adverbial constr. of 468.
 προσφάγιον 25.
 προσφάτως 463.
 προσφέρειν constr. of 427, 432, 593.
 προσφωνεῖν with dat. 36; and acc. 180.

προσωποληπτεῖν 33, 48, 101.
 προσωπολήπτης 101.
 προσωπολήψια 48, 101.
 πρόσωπον without art. 122, cf. 174; Hebr.
 use of 607; πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν 30, 33.
 προφητεύειν augm. of 71.
 πρῶμα 22.
 πρωί 47.
 πρωῖνος 26.
 πρόρης 62.
 πρῶτος for πρότερος 244; for εἰς 248 sq.
 πτόον 24.
 πτώμα 23.
 πύλη ellipsis of 592.
 πῶς 508, 510.

ρ past tenses of verbs beginning with 74.
 ῤαμᾶ indecl. 61.
 ραντίζειν 24, 74.
 ράπισμα 25.
 ραφίς 25.
 ρεύσω 89.
 ρέω 89.
 ῤῆμα without art. 123.
 ῤήσω 22.
 ῤέσθαι constr. of 197.
 ῤύμη 22, 23.
 ῤώμη use of art. with 112.

σ and s 41 sq.
 σάββατον inflec. 63; τὰ σάβ. 177.
 σαλπίζω 89; σαλπίζει sc. ὁ σαλπ. 522.
 Σαμάρεια art. with 112.
 σάρκινος and σαρκικός 98.
 πᾶσα σάρξ 33.
 σαροῦν 24.
 σεβάζεσθαι 23.
 σημαίνω 89.
 σθενόω 26.
 Σίλας 103.
 σινιδίζω 26, 92.
 -σις substantives in 93.
 σιτομέτριον 25.
 σῖτος inflection 68.
 σκανδαλίζειν 33.
 σκάνδαλον 32.
 σκέπτομαι 89.
 σκηνοπηγία 26, 101.
 σκληροκαρδία 26, 99.
 σκληροτράχηλος 26, 99.
 σκληρύνω 92.
 σκορπίζειν 22.
 σκότος, ὁ 22, 66.

-σκω verbs in 92.
 Σολομών inflec. and accent 67.
 Σπανία 25.
 σπείρης 62.
 σπέρμα 30.
 σπῖλος 25.
 σπλάγχνα 18; with gen. 611.
 σπλαγχνίζεσθαι 30, 33; constr. of 221, 233.
 σπουδάζω 89.
 στάμνος 23.
 στέγειν 23.
 στήκω 24, 26; with dat. 210.
 στηρίζω 89; στηρίζειν πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ 33.
 στόμα 18, 30.
 στρέφειν for an adverb ? 469.
 στρηνῶν 25.
 στρωννύειν ἑαυτῷ 594.
 σὺ when expressed 152.
 συγγενίς 69.
 συγκρίνειν 23.
 συγκυρία 24.
 συλλαμβάνειν concipere 593.
 συμβάλλειν τινί or πρὸς τινα sc. λόγους 593.
 συμμαθητής 25.
 συμπολίτης 25.
 σύν 391; distinguished from μετά 391;
 constr. of verbs compounded with 433.
 -συνη substantives in 95.
 συνήμι forms of 81.
 συνιοῦσι 81.
 συνίστημι 23.
 συντίθεσθαι 254.
 Συρία art. with 112.
 Συροφοίνισσα, Συροφουίκισσα 95.
 σχολή 23.
 σώζειν constr. of 197.
 Σάπατρος 103.
 ταμεῖον 24, 94.
 ταπεινοφροσύνη 26, 99.
 ταπεινόφρων 236.
 ταρταροῦν 25.
 ταῦτα referring to a single object 162;
 ταῦτα πάντα and πάντα ταῦτα 548.
 ταχύς comparison of 69.
 τε distinguished from καί 434; τε . . . τε
 439; τε . . . δέ 439; τε καί 439; τε γάρ
 448, 539 sq.; position of 559; with
 πρῶτον 576.
 τεκνίον accent 52.
 τέκνον with gen. of abstracts 238.
 τελέσω fut. 77.
 τέρας 65.

- τέσσερες* etc. 43.
τέτευχε 89.
-της, -οτης substantives in 94.
τίθημι forms of 78.
Τίμων accent 51.
τις, τί in indirect quest. and for the relat. 168 sq.; for *πότερος* 169; *τίς ἐστιν ὅς* with indic. 300, and *οὐ* 481; *τί* used adverbially 142; in exclamations 142; *τί* *ὅτι* 585.
τις, τι (indef.) not used for *ἐί τις* 169; with subst. and adjs. 170 sq.; position of 170, 559; *τι* aliquid (*magni*) 170; *του, τῷ* not used in N. T. 171; *τι* as acc. with verbs 227.
Τίτος and *Τίτος* 52; never has art. 113.
τὸ before entire clauses 109; before a word as a sound 109, 179; before the infin. 320; *τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν* and the like 230.
τοι 434.
τοιγαροῦν 445.
τοίνυν 445, 559.
τοιούτος use of art. with 111.
τολμᾶν alleged pleonasm of 612 sq.
-τος verbals in 96 sq.
τότε as a connective 540; before apod. 541.
τοῦτο used adverbially 142; *τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δὲ* so used 142; *τοῦτ' ἐστιν* ex- exegetical 530.
τρίτον 250.
Τρόφιμος accent 51.
τροχός accent 54.
Τρώς use of art. with 112.
τυγχάνω 89; constr. of 200; supposed to be pleonastic 609.
τυχόν 355.
-ωσαν in imperat. 76 sq.

βαλος 22.
ὀβρίζειν with the acc.
ὀγιῇ accusative 64.
ὀδωρ ellipsis of 591.
ὀετός ellipsis of 592.
ὀὐδς θανάτου 33; *ὀὐδς* with abstr. gen. 238; supposed to be omitted 190, 593; *ὀὐδς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* not equiv. to *ἐγὼ* 144.
Ἰμέναιος accent 51.
-υνω verbs in 92.
ὀπακούειν εἰς 165.
ὀπάρχειν with part. 350.
ὀπέρ with gen. 382 sq.; distinguished from *περί* 383; with acc. 403; as an adverb 423; constr. of verbs compounded with 433.
ὀπερᾶνω 422.
ὀπερέκεινα 463.
ὀπερῶν 422.
ὀπερῶν 96.
ὀπὸ with gen. 364, 368 sq.; confounded with *ἀπὸ* 370 sq.; with acc. 407; constr. of verbs compounded with 433.
ὀποκάτω 422.
ὀπομμνήσκων constr. of 227.
ὀποπιδῶν for *ὀποπιδῶ* 43.
ὀποπιδῶν 26.
ὀποπιδῶ 43.
ὀσπερ 196, 260.
ὀψὺν τῇ δεξιᾷ 215.

φαγεῖν 89; constr. of 198 sq.
φάγεσαι 89.
φάγος accent 51.
φαίνω 89; *φανῆναι* constr. of 233.
φάσκω 90.
φείδεσθαι constr. of 180, 205.
φειδομένως 99.
φειδός 96.
φέρω 90.
φεύγειν constr. of 223.
Φηλιζ accent 52.
φησί sc. *ὁ θεός* 522, 588; in direct discourse 558; ellipsis of, or of *ἐφη* 598.
φθάνειν 23, 90.
φιδάη 22.
φοβείσθαι constr. of 223.
φοίνιξ or *φοῖνιξ* ? 50.
φορέσω fut. 77 sq.
φρυάσσειν 24.
φυεῖς 90.
φυλακίζω 26.
φυλακτήριον 26.
φυλάσσειν νόμον 30; *φυλακῆς* 225; *φυλάσσειν* constr. of 223; signification of 253.
φυσιοῦσθαι 24.
φύω intrans. 22, 252; forms of 90.
φωνεῖν φωνῇ 226.

χαίρει ὑμῖν etc. 549.
χαίρω 90; constr. of 210, 232; *χαίρειν* in salutation 316.
χαρήσομαι 90.
χαρίζομαι 90, 261, 264.
χαρίσομαι 90.
χείλος 18, 30, 32.

- χειλέων* uncontr. 64.
χείρ ellipsis of 592.
Χερουβίμ 68.
χορτάζειν 23.
χρεωφειλέτης 44.
χρῆζειν constr. of 200.
χηματίζειν 23, 260.
χρησθαι constr. of 209 sq.
χρίειν constr. of 227.
χρίσμα accent 50.
Χριστιανός 95.
Χριστός and *ὁ Χριστός* 118; supposed use of to intensify 248.
χρόνος year 177.
χρυσοδακτύλιος 26.
-χυσία 93 note.
χώρα ellipsis of 591.
χωρίζειν constr. of 197.
χωρίς 471; *χωρίς τινος εἶναι* 465.

ψεδδεσθαι constr. 212.
ψεδσμα 24.
ψηφισμα ψηφίζεσθαι 225.
ψευριστής 24.
ψυχίον 24.
ψυχή never redundant 156; *τὸ ψυχικόν* 592.
- ψωμίζειν* 23; with the acc. 226 note.
-ω in the acc. 62.
ὠδίν 65.
ὠθέω 90.
ὦν as an imperf. part. 341.
ὠνέομαι aug. of 70, 90.
ὠνησάμην 70, 90.
ὠτάριον 24, 96.
ὄρα without art. 124; ellipsis of 591 sq.
ὠρώμην 88.
ὥς (not *ὥς* 462) constr. of 296, 448, 449; with infin. 318; always *as* (not *ὅπως*) 462; before a series 519; before a pred. 527; supposed pleonastic 617; force of, particularly before gen. abs. 617; with a prep. of direction 617 sq.; *ὥς . . . καί* 440; *ὥς ὅτι* 618; *ὥς* (*ὥσπερ*) . . . *οὕτως* 440; *ὥς ἂν* 308, 309 note; *ὥς ἔπος εἰπεῖν* 317, 449.
ὥσάμην 71.
ὥσπερ in prot. without apod. 599.
ὥστε constr. of 301, 318, 327; with a negative 480.
ὠτίον 25.
ὠφελεῖν constr. of 227.
ὠφέλμος constr. of 213.

III. INDEX OF PASSAGES IN THE N. T. EXPLAINED OR CITED.

The Figures refer to Pages; those followed by an Asterisk indicate passages not merely referred to or quoted, but commented upon.

Matt. i. 1	125	Matt. iii. 5	68, 268, 438*
Matt. i. 3	366	Matt. iii. 6	528
Matt. i. 6	67, 190	Matt. iii. 7	409
Matt. i. 10'	67	Matt. iii. 8	206, 444
Matt. i. 11	187*, 375*	Matt. iii. 9	151
Matt. i. 12	187*	Matt. iii. 10	110, 266*, 444
Matt. i. 16	366	Matt. iii. 11	75, 217, 266*, 337, 412*, 630
Matt. i. 17	110*, 370	Matt. iii. 12	75, 149*
Matt. i. 18	113, 192, 208*, 330, 368, 455*	Matt. iii. 13	325
" " "	465*, 527, 616*	Matt. iii. 14	269, 436*
Matt. i. 19	330	Matt. iii. 15	269
Matt. i. 20	391*, 401*	Matt. iii. 16	147*, 151*, 369*
Matt. i. 21	141, 150, 182	Matt. iii. 17	132, 232, 278*, 586
Matt. i. 22	461, 562, 563		
Matt. i. 24	436	Matt. iv. 1	106*, 374, 392, 428
Matt. i. 25	107, 182, 296, 436	Matt. iv. 3	334*, 541
		Matt. iv. 4	87, 280*, 377, 389*, 392
Matt. ii. 1	113, 139	Matt. iv. 5	622
Matt. ii. 2	55, 155, 318*, 446*	Matt. iv. 6	373
Matt. ii. 3	68, 111*, 113, 344, 376	Matt. iv. 10	210
Matt. ii. 4	75, 110, 266*, 365	Matt. iv. 11	521
Matt. ii. 6	114, 429	Matt. iv. 12	428
Matt. ii. 7	106	Matt. iv. 15	121, 187*, 231*, 590
Matt. ii. 8	287, 607	Matt. iv. 16	147, 247, 602
Matt. ii. 9	104, 275, 296, 473, 542	Matt. iv. 17	422
Matt. ii. 10	66, 224	Matt. iv. 18	177, 403*, 417*, 446
Matt. ii. 12	260, 428, 481	Matt. iv. 19	228, 606
Matt. ii. 13	79, 267, 434	Matt. iv. 21	113, 132, 190
Matt. ii. 14	104, 428	Matt. iv. 23	131, 132, 145, 186, 426, 539
Matt. ii. 16	365, 370, 401*	Matt. iv. 24	110, 436, 527, 539
Matt. ii. 17	61	Matt. iv. 25	67, 420, 520, 539
Matt. ii. 18	222		
Matt. ii. 20	175, 446*	Matt. v. 1	115, 428
Matt. ii. 22	206, 260, 364*, 375, 471, 472	Matt. v. 2	608
		Matt. v. 3	195, 215, 551, 585
Matt. iii. 3	61	Matt. v. 4	200, 551
Matt. iii. 4	108, 370, 406*, 523	Matt. v. 5	551, 585

Matt. v. 6	205*, 551, 585	Matt. vi. 18	477
Matt. v. 7	551, 585	Matt. vi. 19	501, 594*
Matt. v. 8	215, 551, 585	Matt. vi. 20	488, 489
Matt. v. 9	122, 229, 551, 585, 615	Matt. vi. 22	114
Matt. v. 10	120, 551, 585	Matt. vi. 24	116, 202, 440
Matt. v. 11	222, 551	Matt. vi. 25	156, 209, 299, 488
Matt. v. 13	114, 293, 388, 541	Matt. vi. 26	57, 430, 487*, 514
Matt. v. 15	78, 436	Matt. vi. 27	432
Matt. v. 16	287	Matt. vi. 28	373, 488
Matt. v. 17	127	Matt. vi. 29	110
Matt. v. 18	172, 432, 506, 518, 542,	Matt. vi. 30	341
" " "	552, 612*	Matt. vi. 31	519
Matt. v. 19	160, 246*, 310, 543, 615	Matt. vi. 32	200, 548*
Matt. v. 20	245*, 477, 506	Matt. vi. 34	209, 517, 590
Matt. v. 21	85, 210, 219*, 316, 502, 522	Matt. vii. 1	476, 477, 501
Matt. v. 22	111*, 209, 213*, 455, 621	Matt. vii. 2	165, 388, 412, 429, 522
Matt. v. 23	455*	Matt. vii. 4	285, 429
Matt. v. 25	79, 296*, 502	Matt. vii. 6	388, 487*, 503
Matt. v. 26	506	Matt. vii. 7	57, 522, 552, 593*
Matt. v. 27	316	Matt. vii. 8	266
Matt. v. 28	204	Matt. vii. 9	169*, 227, 310, 512*, 568, 628
Matt. v. 31	85	Matt. vii. 10	440, 441*
Matt. v. 32	56, 496	Matt. vii. 11	139
Matt. v. 33	85, 86, 316	Matt. vii. 12	336*, 455
Matt. v. 34	222, 389*, 481, 488	Matt. vii. 13	73
Matt. v. 35	397*	Matt. vii. 14	143*
Matt. v. 36	76, 490	Matt. vii. 15	384
Matt. v. 37	476	Matt. vii. 16	279*, 370, 372*, 411, 420,
Matt. v. 38	588, 598*	" " "	511, 522*
Matt. v. 39	168, 280*, 481	Matt. vii. 18	488
Matt. v. 40	147, 209	Matt. vii. 21	171*
Matt. v. 41	280*	Matt. vii. 22	71, 110, 510*
Matt. v. 42	254*	Matt. vii. 23	370, 426, 427
Matt. v. 44	222	Matt. vii. 24	71, 155, 209, 225, 279*, 574
Matt. v. 45	445*, 457*	Matt. vii. 25	73, 275, 432, 436, 539
Matt. v. 46	266	Matt. vii. 27	436
Matt. v. 48	315, 540	Matt. vii. 28	296, 393, 608
Matt. vi. 1	31, 121, 259, 329*, 405, 583, 605	Matt. vii. 29	348, 617*
Matt. vi. 2	275*, 287, 540	Matt. viii. 1	147, 220*, 367, 602
Matt. vi. 3	502, 592	Matt. viii. 2	76, 549
Matt. vi. 4	148, 235	Matt. viii. 3	607
Matt. vi. 5	275*, 310, 315, 467*, 502	Matt. viii. 4	106, 146*, 147*, 253*
Matt. vi. 6	94, 132, 433	Matt. viii. 5	61
Matt. vi. 7	387*, 501	Matt. viii. 7	607
Matt. vi. 8	209, 329*, 372	Matt. viii. 8	57, 61, 155, 259, 335, 337, 407
Matt. vi. 9	121, 533*	Matt. viii. 9	407*
Matt. vi. 10	440	Matt. viii. 11	176, 552
Matt. vi. 11	97*	Matt. viii. 12	106
Matt. vi. 12	81, 152, 448*	Matt. viii. 13	61, 259
Matt. vi. 13	197, 501	Matt. viii. 19	117, 310, 576
Matt. vi. 16	56, 275*, 638	Matt. viii. 20	299*, 510
Matt. vi. 17	143, 253		

Matt. viii. 21	576*, 638	Matt. x. 18	407
Matt. viii. 22	330, 576	Matt. x. 19	168, 299, 309
Matt. viii. 23	429, 539	Matt. x. 20	108, 497, 513
Matt. viii. 24	539	Matt. x. 21	64, 213, 409, 514
Matt. viii. 25	539	Matt. x. 22	506
Matt. viii. 28	220, 366, 480	Matt. x. 24	408
Matt. viii. 29	87, 124, 330, 372	Matt. x. 25	337*, 628*
Matt. viii. 30	188	Matt. x. 26	300*, 481, 639
Matt. viii. 31	292, 545	Matt. x. 27	85, 374, 455, 543
Matt. viii. 32	311*, 381	Matt. x. 28	83, 223, 439
Matt. viii. 33	416	Matt. x. 29	172*, 206, 407
Matt. viii. 34	110, 338	Matt. x. 30	131
		Matt. x. 32	226*, 455*
Matt. ix. 1	154, 539	Matt. x. 34	495, 501*
Matt. ix. 2	80, 374, 539	Matt. x. 35	32, 382
Matt. ix. 3	539	Matt. x. 37	408
Matt. ix. 4	169, 539	Matt. x. 38	214, 234
Matt. ix. 5	80, 169	Matt. x. 42	310, 591
Matt. ix. 6	47, 374, 563*, 580*, 620*		
Matt. ix. 8	111, 175*	Matt. xi. 1	145, 608
Matt. ix. 9	608	Matt. xi. 3	341
Matt. ix. 10	608	Matt. xi. 5	239, 260
Matt. ix. 12	495	Matt. xi. 7	73, 106*, 318
Matt. ix. 13	66, 271*, 495, 496*	Matt. xi. 8	227, 442, 591
Matt. ix. 14	227, 518	Matt. xi. 11	59, 244*, 384
Matt. ix. 15	408*, 427, 614*	Matt. xi. 12	259, 363, 370
Matt. ix. 16	394	Matt. xi. 13	71, 634
Matt. ix. 17	605	Matt. xi. 16	209, 432
Matt. ix. 18	117, 442, 545, 607	Matt. xi. 17	437
Matt. ix. 20	230	Matt. xi. 18	488, 552
Matt. ix. 22	183, 370, 549	Matt. xi. 19	51, 371
Matt. ix. 25	296	Matt. xi. 21	304*
Matt. ix. 27	221	Matt. xi. 23	153
Matt. ix. 29	401*	Matt. xi. 24	121
Matt. ix. 30	72, 501	Matt. xi. 25	370, 428, 457, 459, 552, 630
Matt. ix. 31	104	Matt. xi. 26	182
Matt. ix. 34	389	Matt. xi. 27	310, 508
Matt. ix. 35	131, 145, 186, 548, 610	Matt. xi. 29	215
Matt. ix. 36	75, 236, 349		
Matt. ix. 38	198, 338	Matt. xii. 1	63, 77, 116, 118, 177, 218
		Matt. xii. 2	85, 332, 385
Matt. x. 1	185	Matt. xii. 3	77, 519
Matt. x. 2	132	Matt. xii. 4	131, 198
Matt. x. 4	113	Matt. xii. 7	66, 304*
Matt. x. 5	187*	Matt. xii. 9	146*
Matt. x. 8	537	Matt. xii. 10	203, 319*, 332, 509*
Matt. x. 9	489, 493	Matt. xii. 11	169, 202
Matt. x. 10	194, 206, 585	Matt. xii. 12	63, 301, 444
Matt. x. 11	307*, 308, 543	Matt. xii. 13	72, 528
Matt. x. 13	293	Matt. xii. 14	288
Matt. x. 14	129, 429, 488	Matt. xii. 15	147*
Matt. x. 16	413	Matt. xii. 18	156, 278*
Matt. x. 17	213	Matt. xii. 19	82, 488
		Matt. x. 31	196

Matt. xii. 20	70, 82	Matt. xiii. 52	211, 429
Matt. xii. 21	75, 514	Matt. xiii. 53	539, 608
Matt. xii. 23	511	Matt. xiii. 54	589
Matt. xii. 24	126	Matt. xiii. 55	539
Matt. xii. 25	252, 518	Matt. xiii. 56	405, 589
Matt. xii. 26	173*, 279, 292	Matt. xiii. 57	589
Matt. xii. 27	441*	Matt. xiii. 58	539
Matt. xii. 28	90, 292, 445, 541		
Matt. xii. 29	477	Matt. xiv. 1	61, 113, 185
Matt. xii. 30	376, 483*	Matt. xiv. 2	123
Matt. xii. 32	307, 488*, 499, 595*	Matt. xiv. 3	202, 275, 414*
Matt. xii. 33	368	Matt. xiv. 6	218
Matt. xii. 35	106, 135, 174, 524	Matt. xiv. 7	377*
Matt. xii. 36	148, 181, 574	Matt. xiv. 8	558
Matt. xii. 37	368, 441, 609	Matt. xiv. 11	392
Matt. xii. 38	371	Matt. xiv. 18	216
Matt. xii. 39	60, 437	Matt. xiv. 14	233, 141, 147
Matt. xii. 40	540, 541	Matt. xiv. 15	287
Matt. xii. 41	228, 377*, 397*	Matt. xiv. 19	71, 407, 426, 428
Matt. xii. 42	67, 121, 376	Matt. xiv. 20	528
Matt. xii. 43	431	Matt. xiv. 21	552
Matt. xii. 46	274	Matt. xiv. 22	297, 333*, 429
Matt. xii. 50	112, 150, 160	Matt. xiv. 23	330, 428
		Matt. xiv. 24	471*
Matt. xiii. 2	408*	Matt. xiv. 25	374
Matt. xiii. 3	106*, 325, 333	Matt. xiv. 26	371
Matt. xiii. 4	403*	Matt. xiv. 28	380
Matt. xiii. 6	57, 120	Matt. xiv. 29	369*
Matt. xiii. 13	81	Matt. xiv. 31	201*
Matt. xiii. 14	61, 82, 211, 354, 466	Matt. xiv. 33	607
Matt. xiii. 15	494, 503	Matt. xiv. 34	121
Matt. xiii. 16	585	Matt. xiv. 36	306*
Matt. xiii. 18	185*		
Matt. xiii. 19	483	Matt. xv. 2	88, 143, 198, 254, 308*
Matt. xiii. 20	377	Matt. xv. 4	316, 339, 466
Matt. xiii. 22	369	Matt. xv. 5	127, 506, 600*
Matt. xiii. 23	81	Matt. xv. 7	71
Matt. xiii. 24	524*	Matt. xv. 11	106, 499, 495
Matt. xiii. 25	175, 329*, 385, 398	Matt. xv. 16	464*
Matt. xiii. 26	84	Matt. xv. 17	596*
Matt. xiii. 27	510, 548	Matt. xv. 18	429
Matt. xiii. 28	285	Matt. xv. 19	520
Matt. xiii. 29	104, 470, 476	Matt. xv. 20	548
Matt. xiii. 30	225	Matt. xv. 23	173*, 595*
Matt. xiii. 31	607	Matt. xv. 26	319, 513
Matt. xiii. 33	607	Matt. xv. 27	199, 369*
Matt. xiii. 34	268*	Matt. xv. 28	549, 592
Matt. xiii. 41	437	Matt. xv. 29	403*
Matt. xiii. 44	57, 110, 371	Matt. xv. 30	403*
Matt. xiii. 45	523	Matt. xv. 32	168*, 233, 409, 502, 563
Matt. xiii. 47	110	Matt. xv. 34	548*
Matt. xiii. 48	428	Matt. xv. 35	74, 428
Matt. xiii. 49	75	Matt. xv. 38	552

Matt. xvi. 6	223, 580	Matt. xviii. 21	82, 233, 355
Matt. xvi. 7	598*	Matt. xviii. 22	250*
Matt. xvi. 9	205	Matt. xviii. 23	330, 376, 523
Matt. xvi. 11	580*	Matt. xviii. 24	117*
Matt. xvi. 13	529*	Matt. xviii. 25	301, 484*
Matt. xvi. 14	105, 521	Matt. xviii. 27	204, 221
Matt. xvi. 16	114	Matt. xviii. 28	117, 202, 209
Matt. xvi. 17	549, 552	Matt. xviii. 29	545
Matt. xvi. 18	125, 155, 394, 443, 638	Matt. xviii. 31	455
Matt. xvi. 19	32, 65, 121	Matt. xviii. 32	183, 549
Matt. xvi. 20	334*, 477	Matt. xviii. 33	440
Matt. xvi. 21	83, 369, 371, 422		
Matt. xvi. 22	211*, 280*, 507*	Matt. xix. 1	608
Matt. xvi. 26	87, 131*, 564*	Matt. xix. 2	147*
Matt. xvi. 27	564*	Matt. xix. 3	116, 331, 402*, 509
Matt. xvi. 28	198, 506, 508	Matt. xix. 5	183, 262, 523*
		Matt. xix. 6	301
Matt. xvii. 1	428	Matt. xix. 8	124, 405*
Matt. xvii. 2	437	Matt. xix. 9	394
Matt. xvii. 3	433	Matt. xix. 10	292, 319, 465
Matt. xvii. 4	66, 173, 292, 319	Matt. xix. 11	158, 171
Matt. xvii. 5	71, 199, 278*, 431	Matt. xix. 12	122
Matt. xvii. 6	74, 125, 174	Matt. xix. 13	270, 288*
Matt. xvii. 9	123, 366	Matt. xix. 17	292
Matt. xvii. 11	265*	Matt. xix. 18	87, 109, 502
Matt. xvii. 12	218*, 369	Matt. xix. 19	316
Matt. xvii. 14	210	Matt. xix. 21	607
Matt. xvii. 15	155	Matt. xix. 22	343, 349*
Matt. xvii. 16	84	Matt. xix. 24	319
Matt. xvii. 17	83, 202	Matt. xix. 25	445
Matt. xvii. 18	142*	Matt. xix. 26	395
Matt. xvii. 19	152, 457	Matt. xix. 28	408, 409
Matt. xvii. 20	247*, 471	Matt. xix. 29	43, 200
Matt. xvii. 24	85		
Matt. xvii. 25	420, 129, 370*, 540	Matt. xx. 1	213*, 254, 523
Matt. xvii. 27	364, 561	Matt. xx. 2	368*, 376, 433
		Matt. xx. 3	124, 384, 406
Matt. xviii. 1	244, 445	Matt. xx. 8	621
Matt. xviii. 3	469*, 506	Matt. xx. 9	398
Matt. xviii. 4	45, 257, 308	Matt. xx. 10	321, 437*
Matt. xviii. 5	393*	Matt. xx. 12	209
Matt. xviii. 6	337*, 611*	Matt. xx. 13	206
Matt. xviii. 7	371	Matt. xx. 15	509
Matt. xviii. 8	241, 320, 518	Matt. xx. 18	210
Matt. xviii. 9	177	Matt. xx. 19	88, 218
Matt. xviii. 11	178	Matt. xx. 20	170*, 227
Matt. xviii. 12	211	Matt. xx. 21	122, 125, 173, 367, 552
Matt. xviii. 13	232, 293	Matt. xx. 22	32, 168
Matt. xviii. 14	117	Matt. xx. 23	451, 582
Matt. xviii. 15	82, 87	Matt. xx. 24	64, 232
Matt. xviii. 16	375, 440	Matt. xx. 25	613
Matt. xviii. 17	106, 293	Matt. xx. 28	318, 364, 383
Matt. xviii. 19	163	Matt. xx. 29	67

Matt. xx. 30	87, 251, 404	Matt. xxii. 44	81
Matt. xx. 31	549		
		Matt. xxiii. 4	78, 430
Matt. xxi. 1	182, 396	Matt. xxiii. 5	452*, 456
Matt. xxi. 2	155*	Matt. xxiii. 8	155
Matt. xxi. 3	453*	Matt. xxiii. 9	488, 590*
Matt. xxi. 4	563, 564*	Matt. xxiii. 10	488
Matt. xxi. 5	85, 155, 156*, 430, 437	Matt. xxiii. 12	253, 280*, 543
Matt. xxi. 6	564	Matt. xxiii. 15	552, 592*
Matt. xxi. 7	143, 175*	Matt. xxiii. 20	88
Matt. xxi. 8	270, 417, 515	Matt. xxiii. 23	66, 520
Matt. xxi. 9	551, 585	Matt. xxiii. 25	201*
Matt. xxi. 11	370	Matt. xxiii. 27	63, 209
Matt. xxi. 13	31, 267, 615	Matt. xxiii. 30	80, 304, 523
Matt. xxi. 19	117*, 375*, 508	Matt. xxiii. 31	151, 212*, 301
Matt. xxi. 20	276*	Matt. xxiii. 32	311*, 437*
Matt. xxi. 21	261	Matt. xxiii. 33	223*, 285
Matt. xxi. 22	307*	Matt. xxiii. 34	64, 84, 419, 459, 594*, 598
Matt. xxi. 23	220, 441	Matt. xxiii. 35	61, 129, 459, 462, 587
Matt. xxi. 24	173, 227	Matt. xxiii. 36	548
Matt. xxi. 31	64, 169	Matt. xxiii. 37	230, 330
Matt. xxi. 33	71, 523	Matt. xxiii. 39	456, 506, 551
Matt. xxi. 35	105		
Matt. xxi. 36	244	Matt. xxiv. 1	429
Matt. xxi. 37	221	Matt. xxiv. 2	300, 409, 481*,
Matt. xxi. 40	308*	Matt. xxiv. 4	504
Matt. xxi. 41	83, 144*, 637*	Matt. xxiv. 6	185*, 501*
Matt. xxi. 42	164, 238, 365*, 385	Matt. xxiv. 7	41, 401
		Matt. xxiv. 9	213, 348
Matt. xxii. 1	602	Matt. xxiv. 10	173
Matt. xxii. 2	176	Matt. xxiv. 12	110
Matt. xxii. 3	56	Matt. xxiv. 13	160
Matt. xxii. 4	126	Matt. xxiv. 15	79, 563
Matt. xxii. 5	154, 528	Matt. xxiv. 16	407, 412
Matt. xxii. 10	201	Matt. xxiv. 17	362, 368, 501, 502, 629*
Matt. xxii. 12	483	Matt. xxiv. 18	417, 502
Matt. xxii. 13	552	Matt. xxiv. 20	207, 489
Matt. xxii. 16	95, 206, 424, 463, 499	Matt. xxiv. 21	123, 499, 505
Matt. xxii. 17	333, 509	Matt. xxiv. 22	363, 171, 234, 477
Matt. xxii. 22	74	Matt. xxiv. 24	65, 333, 585
Matt. xxii. 23	267	Matt. xxiv. 26	175
Matt. xxii. 24	482	Matt. xxiv. 27	176
Matt. xxii. 25	84, 342, 475*	Matt. xxiv. 30	374
Matt. xxii. 28	195, 385, 446	Matt. xxiv. 31	247, 377
Matt. xxii. 29	489	Matt. xxiv. 32	90
Matt. xxii. 30	488	Matt. xxiv. 33	123, 176, 392, 548
Matt. xxii. 33	232	Matt. xxiv. 34	508
Matt. xxii. 36	246*	Matt. xxiv. 35	506, 552
Matt. xxii. 37	143	Matt. xxiv. 38	164*
Matt. xxii. 39	151	Matt. xxiv. 40	116, 173, 266*, 384
Matt. xxii. 40	64	Matt. xxiv. 41	95
Matt. xxii. 42	113	Matt. xxiv. 44	57, 165
Matt. xxii. 43	228	Matt. xxiv. 45	325, 524

Matt. xxiv. 46	551	Matt. xxvi. 37	177
Matt. xxiv. 50	422	Matt. xxvi. 38	122, 156
		Matt. xxvi. 39	73, 74, 125
Matt. xxv. 1	279	Matt. xxvi. 40	267, 330
Matt. xxv. 6	907	Matt. xxvi. 42	477
Matt. xxv. 9	209, 504*, 582, 598*	Matt. xxvi. 43	83
Matt. xxv. 11	610	Matt. xxvi. 44	71, 424*
Matt. xxv. 13	489	Matt. xxvi. 45	311*
Matt. xxv. 14	154, 599	Matt. xxvi. 48	275*
Matt. xxv. 15	154, 401	Matt. xxvi. 50	167*, 275, 409
Matt. xxv. 16	72	Matt. xxvi. 51	607
Matt. xxv. 19	433	Matt. xxvi. 53	436, 596
Matt. xxv. 20	67, 393*	Matt. xxvi. 54	285*
Matt. xxv. 21	409, 524	Matt. xxvi. 55	74
Matt. xxv. 23	30	Matt. xxvi. 58	603
Matt. xxv. 24	159*	Matt. xxvi. 59	270, 438*
Matt. xxv. 26	549	Matt. xxvi. 60	437
Matt. xxv. 27	382*, 303	Matt. xxvi. 62	432, 606*
Matt. xxv. 29	488	Matt. xxvi. 63	293, 382
Matt. xxv. 32	75, 427	Matt. xxvi. 65	257
Matt. xxv. 33	123, 552	Matt. xxvi. 66	202
Matt. xxv. 34	189*, 370	Matt. xxvi. 67	74, 106*, 125, 430
Matt. xxv. 35	77, 80, 84	Matt. xxvi. 69	66
Matt. xxv. 36	73, 74	Matt. xxvi. 71	147, 178*
Matt. xxv. 37	261	Matt. xxvi. 72	545
Matt. xxv. 40	409	Matt. xxvi. 73	235
Matt. xxv. 41	122	Matt. xxvi. 74	68, 457*
Matt. xxv. 45	261, 409		
		Matt. xxvii. 1	318, 382
Matt. xxvi. 1	608	Matt. xxvii. 2	138
Matt. xxvi. 2	265*, 329	Matt. xxvii. 4	47, 76
Matt. xxvi. 4	66	Matt. xxvii. 5	253*, 385, 414*
Matt. xxvi. 5	582, 596*	Matt. xxvii. 7	206, 211*, 368*
Matt. xxvi. 8	397	Matt. xxvii. 8	690
Matt. xxvi. 9	70, 206, 282	Matt. xxvii. 9	61
Matt. xxvi. 10	72, 397	Matt. xxvii. 12	261
Matt. xxvi. 11	446	Matt. xxvii. 13	432
Matt. xxvi. 12	376*	Matt. xxvii. 14	173*
Matt. xxvi. 15	176	Matt. xxvii. 15	401*
Matt. xxvi. 16	422	Matt. xxvii. 18	268, 399*
Matt. xxvi. 17	66, 218, 285	Matt. xxvii. 21	582
Matt. xxvi. 18	75	Matt. xxvii. 22	143, 222, 444, 455*
Matt. xxvi. 23	414*, 429*	Matt. xxvii. 23	447*
Matt. xxvi. 24	282*, 305, 379*	Matt. xxvii. 24	47, 113, 197
Matt. xxvi. 25	85	Matt. xxvii. 25	587
Matt. xxvi. 26	106, 114, 116, 403	Matt. xxvii. 28	226
Matt. xxvi. 28	114, 132, 191, 341, 411	Matt. xxvii. 29	182, 366, 408, 592
Matt. xxvi. 29	422	Matt. xxvii. 30	430
Matt. xxvi. 32	329*	Matt. xxvii. 31	88, 226
Matt. xxvi. 33	292*, 582	Matt. xxvii. 32	182
Matt. xxvi. 34	330	Matt. xxvii. 33	166
Matt. xxvi. 35	506, 571	Matt. xxvii. 34	319, 330, 376
Matt. xxvi. 36	472	Matt. xxvii. 35	257

Matt. xxvii. 37	275*, 340	Mark i. 22	232, 437
Matt. xxvii. 38	122, 173	Mark i. 24	66, 585, 626
Matt. xxvii. 39	222, 268	Mark i. 26	164
Matt. xxvii. 40	79, 135, 292, 353*	Mark i. 27	436
Matt. xxvii. 41	571	Mark i. 29	61
Matt. xxvii. 43	214, 233, 409	Mark i. 31	268
Matt. xxvii. 44	175*, 227	Mark i. 32	64, 106, 120
Matt. xxvii. 45	43, 111, 124, 407	Mark i. 34	81, 85, 145
Matt. xxvii. 46	63, 169	Mark i. 35	46, 71, 608*
Matt. xxvii. 47	79, 559	Mark i. 38	46, 558
Matt. xxvii. 48	607	Mark i. 39	416
Matt. xxvii. 50	164, 226	Mark i. 40	76, 210, 606
Matt. xxvii. 51	603	Mark i. 41	344
Matt. xxvii. 52	514	Mark i. 42	427
Matt. xxvii. 54	270*	Mark i. 44	146*, 313, 499
Matt. xxvii. 55	275	Mark i. 45	86, 392, 480, 524
Matt. xxvii. 56	66, 190		
Matt. xxvii. 57	370	Mark ii. 1	380*, 413, 415*, 539, 595
Matt. xxvii. 58	113	Mark ii. 2	405, 480
Matt. xxvii. 60	427	Mark ii. 4	330, 473
Matt. xxvii. 62	113	Mark ii. 5	80
Matt. xxvii. 63	403	Mark ii. 6	349
Matt. xxvii. 64	123	Mark ii. 8	554*
Matt. xxvii. 66	377	Mark ii. 9	314
		Mark ii. 10	580
Matt. xxviii. 1	203, 248, 471	Mark ii. 13	86
Matt. xxviii. 2	344	Mark ii. 14	66, 608
Matt. xxviii. 3	247	Mark ii. 15	527
Matt. xxviii. 5	135	Mark ii. 16	128, 457, 585
Matt. xxviii. 7	123, 276	Mark ii. 18	128, 145, 348*
Matt. xxviii. 8	377	Mark ii. 19	332, 386
Matt. xxviii. 9	296	Mark ii. 21	524
Matt. xxviii. 12	176	Mark ii. 23	116, 256*, 323*, 578*
Matt. xxviii. 14	293, 375	Mark ii. 24	613*
		Mark ii. 25	77, 150
Matt. xxviii. 16	396, 471	Mark ii. 26	375, 439*
Matt. xxviii. 17	105*	Mark ii. 27	145, 270
Matt. xxviii. 18	116		
Matt. xxviii. 19	23, 141, 192, 251, 314	Mark iii. 2	299*
		Mark iii. 3	234
Mark i. 1	125, 187	Mark iii. 5	72, 232, 313, 393
Mark i. 4	188*, 350*	Mark iii. 6	299
Mark i. 5	438	Mark iii. 7	396
Mark i. 6	66, 198	Mark iii. 8	67
Mark i. 7	148, 268, 319	Mark iii. 9	336, 433
Mark i. 8	150	Mark iii. 10	426, 430
Mark i. 9	416	Mark iii. 11	309*, 433, 514
Mark i. 10	554*	Mark iii. 13	428
Mark i. 13	40, 376, 539	Mark iii. 14	318, 579
Mark i. 14	329	Mark iii. 15	579
Mark i. 15	213	Mark iii. 16	182, 276*, 564, 579*
Mark i. 16	413, 417*	Mark iii. 17	132, 564*, 579
Mark i. 17	606, 608	Mark iii. 18	564, 579

Mark iii. 19	579	Mark v. 34	79
Mark iii. 20	480, 489*	Mark v. 37	499
Mark iii. 21	277*, 366*	Mark v. 39	495*
Mark iii. 22	277	Mark v. 40	159
Mark iii. 24	145, 252	Mark v. 41	141, 182
Mark iii. 26	272	Mark v. 42	196, 446, 456, 477
Mark iii. 27	293	Mark v. 43	477
Mark iii. 30	445	Mark vi. 1	267
Mark iii. 34	406	Mark vi. 2	344, 607
		Mark vi. 3	114, 126
Mark iv. 1	405*	Mark vi. 4	420
Mark iv. 3	543	Mark vi. 5	70, 143
Mark iv. 4	514, 608	Mark vi. 6	232
Mark iv. 10	227, 270	Mark vi. 7	249*
Mark iv. 12	459, 461*, 494, 503*	Mark vi. 8	316, 545, 578*
Mark iv. 13	279	Mark vi. 9	579
Mark iv. 19	192*, 369	Mark vi. 11	313
Mark iv. 21	127, 287, 430, 511	Mark vi. 13	227
Mark iv. 22	235	Mark vi. 14	123
Mark iv. 25	446	Mark vi. 16	123, 164, 628
Mark iv. 28	464, 528	Mark vi. 17	84, 118
Mark iv. 29	251*	Mark vi. 19	70, 330, 593*
Mark iv. 30	212, 517	Mark vi. 21	128, 218
Mark iv. 31	133, 242	Mark vi. 23	64
Mark iv. 32	242		
Mark iv. 33	111	Mark vi. 25	336*, 592
Mark iv. 37	251*, 430	Mark vi. 31	71
Mark iv. 38	150	Mark vi. 32	216
Mark iv. 39	312, 315*, 538	Mark vi. 34	233
Mark iv. 41	224	Mark vi. 36	168*
		Mark vi. 37	152*
Mark v. 2	147, 220	Mark vi. 39	229*, 249, 392, 464*
Mark v. 3	390, 490, 499	Mark vi. 40	74, 249, 398, 401, 464*
Mark v. 4	50, 329, 334	Mark vi. 41	145
Mark v. 5	349	Mark vi. 45	298
Mark v. 7	585	Mark vi. 46	141
Mark v. 9	145	Mark vi. 47	123
Mark v. 10	334*	Mark vi. 48	330, 406*
Mark v. 11	849, 395	Mark vi. 52	392
Mark v. 13	514, 562	Mark vi. 56	201, 306*, 584*
Mark v. 14	268		
Mark v. 15	267	Mark vii. 2	530, 562
Mark v. 16	298	Mark vii. 3	253, 254, 562
Mark v. 18	270, 336	Mark vii. 4	121, 319*, 621*
Mark v. 19	221	Mark vii. 6	71
Mark v. 21	407	Mark vii. 11	563, 600*
Mark v. 23	87, 289, 315	Mark vii. 12	499
Mark v. 25	184*, 344	Mark vii. 13	163
Mark v. 26	344, 366*, 486, 629	Mark vii. 14	199
Mark v. 27	344	Mark vii. 15	91, 114, 160, 429
Mark v. 29	259	Mark vii. 17	270
Mark v. 30	155, 201, 413, 414*, 554*	Mark vii. 18	91, 596*
Mark v. 33	110, 433	Mark vii. 19	532, 533*, 624

Mark vii. 20	160	Mark ix. 22	76, 233, 313, 442
Mark vii. 24	437, 608	Mark ix. 23	109
Mark vii. 25	148, 432, 602	Mark ix. 24	155
Mark vii. 26	95, 230, 336, 562	Mark ix. 25	142, 182
Mark vii. 27	330	Mark ix. 26	526
Mark vii. 28	514	Mark ix. 27	149, 202
Mark vii. 31	398	Mark ix. 28	143, 147, 149, 457
Mark vii. 32	430	Mark ix. 30	336*
Mark vii. 34	428	Mark ix. 34	244
Mark vii. 35	270, 622		
Mark vii. 36	150, 240, 603	Mark ix. 37	111*, 497
Mark vii. 37	118	Mark ix. 39	313
		Mark ix. 40	382, 383
Mark viii. 1	526	Mark ix. 41	144, 226, 506
Mark viii. 2	233, 409, 563	Mark ix. 42	243, 432
Mark viii. 3	87, 125	Mark ix. 43	241, 313
Mark viii. 4	374, 529, 605	Mark ix. 45	241
Mark viii. 6	288*, 344, 428	Mark ix. 47	320
Mark viii. 7	548*	Mark ix. 50	390*
Mark viii. 8	529*		
Mark viii. 11	342, 365	Mark x. 2	116, 118, 342
Mark viii. 12	500*	Mark x. 6	124
Mark viii. 15	223, 313	Mark x. 7	432*
Mark viii. 17	108, 174, 528	Mark x. 10	415*
Mark viii. 19	213*	Mark x. 12	84
Mark viii. 22	149*, 336	Mark x. 13	270, 288, 522*
Mark viii. 23	509		
Mark viii. 26	489*	Mark x. 16	143
Mark viii. 27	187*	Mark x. 17	210, 270, 348
Mark viii. 29	114	Mark x. 19	501
Mark viii. 31	370	Mark x. 21	313, 430, 470*
Mark viii. 34	168	Mark x. 24	214, 233
Mark viii. 35	83	Mark x. 26	437
Mark viii. 38	221, 308	Mark x. 27	430
		Mark x. 29	420
Mark ix. 1	79	Mark x. 30	377*, 500
Mark ix. 2	116, 267		
Mark ix. 3	75, 350*	Mark x. 32	348*, 428
Mark ix. 4	348	Mark x. 34	430
Mark ix. 5	66	Mark x. 35	518
Mark ix. 6	299	Mark x. 37	122, 173, 337
Mark ix. 7	114, 313, 431	Mark x. 38	84, 225, 229
Mark ix. 8	451*, 499	Mark x. 40	271, 552
Mark ix. 9	123, 297, 301, 367	Mark x. 41	232, 521
Mark ix. 10	123	Mark x. 42	206, 613*
Mark ix. 11	167*, 457*	Mark x. 46	118
Mark ix. 12	78, 409, 462*	Mark x. 47	113
Mark ix. 13	218, 540		
Mark ix. 15	515, 516, 554*	Mark xi. 1	296
Mark ix. 17	278*	Mark xi. 4	118
Mark ix. 18	307, 437	Mark xi. 5	79, 609*
Mark ix. 19	83, 549	Mark xi. 6	85
Mark ix. 20	568*, 632	Mark xi. 7	430

Mark xi. 8	398, 417	Mark xiii. 1	117, 526
Mark xi. 9	128	Mark xiii. 2	409, 506
Mark xi. 10	113	Mark xiii. 3	415
Mark xi. 12	77	Mark xiii. 4	85
Mark xi. 13	300*, 445, 596*	Mark xiii. 7	501
Mark xi. 14	476, 499, 501*	Mark xiii. 9	152, 163, 375, 416*
Mark xi. 15	267	Mark xiii. 10	213
Mark xi. 16	81	Mark xiii. 11	114, 299, 313, 501
Mark xi. 17	267, 276	Mark xiii. 14	79, 396*, 412, 541
Mark xi. 18	128, 232, 270, 299	Mark xiii. 15	431, 488, 502
Mark xi. 20	424*	Mark xiii. 16	415, 417
Mark xi. 21	271, 276	Mark xiii. 17	128
Mark xi. 22	186	Mark xiii. 19	124, 148, 506
Mark xi. 23	261, 561	Mark xiii. 20	107, 304*
Mark xi. 24	306	Mark xiii. 22	333
Mark xi. 25	309*	Mark xiii. 23	152
Mark xi. 27	128, 207	Mark xiii. 25	133, 348
Mark xi. 28	438	Mark xiii. 27	121, 125
Mark xi. 29	437	Mark xiii. 28	90, 313
Mark xi. 31	579	Mark xiii. 29	123, 605
Mark xi. 32	545, 579*, 626	Mark xiii. 30	506
Mark xi. 33	84	Mark xiii. 32	129, 373
		Mark xiii. 33	84
Mark xii. 2	456, 199, 288, 365*	Mark xiii. 34	462
Mark xii. 4	468		
Mark xii. 5	105, 583*	Mark xiv. 1	299, 388, 424
Mark xii. 7	85, 114, 195	Mark xiv. 2	456, 503, 596*
Mark xii. 11	238	Mark xiv. 3	97*, 188, 381*, 544
Mark xii. 12	330, 437, 561*	Mark xiv. 4	349*
Mark xii. 13	128	Mark xiv. 5	70, 206, 250
Mark xii. 14	285*, 474*, 509	Mark xiv. 6	72, 218, 524
Mark xii. 16	85	Mark xiv. 7	222
Mark xii. 17	232, 393	Mark xiv. 8	467*
Mark xii. 18	267	Mark xiv. 9	307
Mark xii. 19	289	Mark xiv. 11	331
Mark xii. 20	475	Mark xiv. 12	269, 285, 296
Mark xii. 23	605*	Mark xiv. 13	83, 188
Mark xii. 24	161*		
Mark xii. 25	121, 123	Mark xiv. 15	313, 525
Mark xii. 26	63, 376*, 585	Mark xiv. 19	249
Mark xii. 28	178*, 248	Mark xiv. 20	429
		Mark xiv. 21	320, 545
Mark xii. 30	143, 368	Mark xiv. 22	57, 116, 345
Mark xii. 31	239	Mark xiv. 24	411
Mark xii. 32	85, 425*	Mark xiv. 25	468
Mark xii. 33	118, 127, 420	Mark xiv. 27	57
Mark xii. 34	499, 626	Mark xiv. 29	152, 582*
Mark xii. 36	81	Mark xiv. 31	331, 506
Mark xii. 38	183, 223, 384, 468*, 577	Mark xiv. 32	297*
Mark xii. 39	183	Mark xiv. 33	118
Mark xii. 40	160, 183*, 532, 564, 579	Mark xiv. 35	376*, 432
Mark xii. 41	268	Mark xiv. 36	58, 168, 432, 442, 584
Mark xii. 44	528	Mark xiv. 37	549

Mark xiv. 38	313	Mark xv. 46	426, 427
Mark xiv. 40	83, 299	Mark xv. 47	190, 268
Mark xiv. 43	128, 365*		
Mark xiv. 44	72, 275, 313	Mark xvi. 1	113, 190, 276
Mark xiv. 46	275	Mark xvi. 2	248, 343*
Mark xiv. 47	96, 117, 118, 253, 254	Mark xvi. 3	362*, 364*, 366, 561
Mark xiv. 49	317*, 620	Mark xvi. 4	271, 446
Mark xiv. 51	118	Mark xvi. 5	345*
Mark xiv. 52	223	Mark xvi. 6	538
Mark xiv. 53	215*	Mark xvi. 7	438, 521
Mark xiv. 54	248, 433	Mark xvi. 8	452*
Mark xiv. 55	71, 270	Mark xvi. 9	73
Mark xiv. 58	345	Mark xvi. 11	259
Mark xiv. 60	118, 123, 511	Mark xvi. 12	121
Mark xiv. 61	261	Mark xvi. 15	124, 314
Mark xiv. 64	199	Mark xvi. 17	524
Mark xiv. 65	430	Mark xvi. 18	506
Mark xiv. 67	80, 145	Mark xvi. 19	428
Mark xiv. 68	490		
Mark xiv. 69	79	Luke i. 1	276*, 448*, 541, 545, 613*
Mark xiv. 71	88	Luke i. 2	545
Mark xiv. 72	205	Luke i. 3	545
		Luke i. 4	165, 288
Mark xv. 1	113, 128*	Luke i. 5	125
Mark xv. 2	114	Luke i. 6	127
Mark xv. 3	203	Luke i. 8	329, 608
Mark xv. 4	499	Luke i. 9	56, 200*, 319, 321, 324, 353*
Mark xv. 5	499	Luke i. 12	430
Mark xv. 6	269	Luke i. 13	182
Mark xv. 7	73	Luke i. 14	90, 211, 232
Mark xv. 8	584*	Luke i. 15	68, 506
Mark xv. 10	72	Luke i. 17	318, 61, 146, 432
Mark xv. 12	165, 222	Luke i. 18	152
Mark xv. 13	144	Luke i. 20	164, 349, 364*, 486*, 610
Mark xv. 14	113	Luke i. 21	232*, 515
Mark xv. 15	113	Luke i. 22	70, 150*
Mark xv. 16	166*	Luke i. 23	296, 540
Mark xv. 17	78, 226	Luke i. 24	88
Mark xv. 19	430	Luke i. 25	57, 422, 445
Mark xv. 21	121*	Luke i. 26	219
Mark xv. 24	408*, 628	Luke i. 27	73
Mark xv. 25	57, 124, 126, 436*, 539	Luke i. 28	585
Mark xv. 30	79, 313	Luke i. 29	161, 299
Mark xv. 31	381, 571	Luke i. 30	365*
Mark xv. 33	126	Luke i. 31	593*, 607*
Mark xv. 34	226	Luke i. 32	113
Mark xv. 38	603	Luke i. 33	206, 409
Mark xv. 39	591*	Luke i. 34	480
Mark xv. 40	190, 603	Luke i. 35	178, 430
Mark xv. 41	140	Luke i. 36	64, 69, 110
Mark xv. 43	113, 348	Luke i. 37	171, 173*, 280*, 395
Mark xv. 44	272*, 298, 542	Luke i. 38	427
Mark xv. 45	113, 365, 371	Luke i. 39	591, 608
Mark xiv. 70	269		

Luke i. 40	61	Luke ii. 28	150*
Luke i. 41	608	Luke ii. 30	607
Luke i. 42	246*, 551	Luke ii. 31	174, 400
Luke i. 43	337*, 338	Luke ii. 33	519
Luke i. 44	386	Luke ii. 34	184*, 397
Luke i. 45	585	Luke ii. 35	310, 366, 462*
Luke i. 46	639	Luke ii. 36	41, 138, 149, 604*
Luke i. 47	393, 639	Luke ii. 37	427, 593
Luke i. 48	75, 430	Luke ii. 39	275
Luke i. 51	125, 277*, 388	Luke ii. 41	68, 215*, 230, 531
Luke i. 53	201, 228	Luke ii. 42	196
Luke i. 54	202	Luke ii. 44	188*, 226*, 231
Luke i. 55	562, 577*	Luke ii. 45	342, 344*, 484
Luke i. 57	324	Luke ii. 46	199
Luke i. 58	128	Luke ii. 48	276, 518
Luke i. 59	228, 269*, 394*, 410	Luke iii. 1	61, 126, 138*, 219
Luke i. 62	109, 308*	Luke iii. 2	41, 60, 122, 375
Luke i. 64	72, 622*	Luke iii. 5	591
Luke i. 66	174	Luke iii. 7	270
Luke i. 67	71	Luke iii. 8	674
Luke i. 68	469*, 551	Luke iii. 10	279
Luke i. 70	132, 562, 606	Luke iii. 11	482
Luke i. 72	164, 205, 376	Luke iii. 13	105, 240, 404
Luke i. 73	164, 225, 226, 326*, 577, 628*	Luke iii. 14	233
Luke i. 74	197, 627	Luke iii. 15	299
Luke i. 75	230, 321, 386	Luke iii. 16	261, 413*
Luke i. 76	153, 432, 607, 615	Luke iii. 18	223, 525*
Luke i. 78	611	Luke iii. 19	61, 144
Luke i. 79	89, 431	Luke iii. 20	393
Luke ii. 1	254*, 319, 365, 429, 534, 608	Luke iii. 21	72, 323
Luke ii. 2	244*	Luke iii. 22	132, 232
Luke ii. 4	125, 329, 330, 364*	Luke iii. 23	196, 349*
Luke ii. 5	73	Luke iii. 27	60
Luke ii. 7	211*, 385	Luke iii. 29	52, 66
Luke ii. 8	225, 349, 409	Luke iii. 30	67
Luke ii. 10	208	Luke iii. 32	67
Luke ii. 11	125	Luke iii. 37	52
Luke ii. 12	118, 345*	Luke iv. 2	77, 499, 544
Luke ii. 13	68, 526	Luke iv. 3	336
Luke ii. 14	120	Luke iv. 6	271*
Luke ii. 15	427	Luke iv. 7	214, 291
Luke ii. 16	4, 113, 439	Luke iv. 8	210
Luke ii. 17	132	Luke iv. 9	118
Luke ii. 18	232	Luke iv. 10	326
Luke ii. 20	57, 163	Luke iv. 12	316
Luke ii. 21	324, 329, 438*, 605*	Luke iv. 14	382
Luke ii. 22	147*, 325, 401, 428	Luke iv. 15	145, 150, 353*
Luke ii. 23	123, 562	Luke iv. 16	177, 211, 217
Luke ii. 24	123, 325	Luke iv. 18	43, 223, 272*
Luke ii. 25	585	Luke iv. 20	106
Luke ii. 26	122, 297, 481	Luke iv. 22	212, 237
Luke ii. 27	64, 325	Luke iv. 23	247, 416*, 529

Luke iv. 25	61, 63, 296, 408*	Luke vi. 16	131, 190
Luke iv. 26	187, 508	Luke vi. 17	141, 259
Luke iv. 27	375	Luke vi. 18	371*
Luke iv. 29	71, 118, 329, 374, 603	Luke vi. 19	268, 330, 515
Luke iv. 30	378	Luke vi. 20	143, 396, 607
Luke iv. 31	348	Luke vi. 21	84
Luke iv. 32	232	Luke vi. 23	121, 268, 558
Luke iv. 34	234, 626	Luke vi. 25	87
Luke iv. 35	50, 123, 227, 344*, 483*, 544	Luke vi. 27	222
Luke iv. 36	386, 584	Luke vi. 29	501
Luke iv. 38	621	Luke vi. 30	592*
Luke iv. 40	84, 120, 544	Luke vi. 31	540
Luke iv. 41	346, 514	Luke vi. 34	295, 331, 428
Luke iv. 42	325, 471, 604	Luke vi. 35	45, 118, 409, 477
		Luke vi. 37	506
Luke v. 1	199, 348, 404, 608	Luke vi. 38	112, 412, 525
Luke v. 2	404, 427	Luke vi. 39	511
Luke v. 3	335, 366*	Luke vi. 42	150, 366*, 485
Luke v. 4	397*, 541, 580*	Luke vi. 44	111, 412, 488
Luke v. 5	394*	Luke vi. 47	111, 155
Luke v. 7	325	Luke vi. 48	73, 225, 330, 469*, 603
Luke v. 8	549	Luke vi. 49	483
Luke v. 9	163, 544		
Luke v. 10	209, 211, 348, 571	Luke vii. 1	275
Luke v. 12	122, 198, 545, 608	Luke vii. 3	338
Luke v. 14	146*, 481, 545, 579, 598	Luke vii. 4	76
Luke v. 15	268, 371, 411	Luke vii. 5	150*
Luke v. 16	150, 413, 414*	Luke vii. 6	61
Luke v. 17	146*, 147, 150, 436	Luke vii. 7	442, 595
Luke v. 19	207*, 428, 590	Luke vii. 8	349*
Luke v. 20	80	Luke vii. 9	490, 493
Luke v. 21	465	Luke vii. 11	590
Luke v. 23	80	Luke vii. 12	211*, 296, 438*, 605
Luke v. 24	580	Luke vii. 13	233
Luke v. 25	158, 408*	Luke vii. 16	190
Luke v. 27	182	Luke vii. 17	413, 414*
Luke v. 29	66	Luke vii. 18	548
Luke v. 30	376	Luke vii. 19	341, 594
Luke v. 32	271*	Luke vii. 20	271
Luke v. 33	85	Luke vii. 21	323
Luke v. 36	430, 523	Luke vii. 22	123, 260
Luke v. 37	150	Luke vii. 25	227
		Luke vii. 29	110, 564*
Luke vi. 1	100*, 116, 323, 431	Luke vii. 30	213*, 484
Luke vi. 2	559	Luke vii. 31	564
Luke vi. 3	296, 519	Luke vii. 33	86, 483*
Luke vi. 6	323	Luke vii. 34	51, 86, 552
Luke vi. 7	253, 288	Luke vii. 36	117, 270, 336
Luke vi. 8	123	Luke vii. 37	268, 344, 544
Luke vi. 10	72	Luke vii. 39	304*, 541
Luke vi. 11	76, 303, 308*	Luke vii. 42	169, 240
Luke vi. 12	185, 348	Luke vii. 43	582
Luke vi. 13	370, 432*	Luke vii. 44	110

Luke vii. 45	345, 592	Luke ix. 13	116, 239, 294*, 516*
Luke vii. 47	80, 132, 456*	Luke ix. 14	229*, 464
Luke vii. 50	143, 271	Luke ix. 16	106, 116, 340, 344, 428
		Luke ix. 19	103*, 138
Luke viii. 2	514	Luke ix. 20	549
Luke viii. 3	198, 340, 366	Luke ix. 22	83, 371*
Luke viii. 5	105, 225, 333, 576	Luke ix. 25	87, 253
Luke viii. 6	90, 482	Luke ix. 26	543
Luke viii. 7	90, 123	Luke ix. 27	198*, 308, 506
Luke viii. 8	90, 132, 319	Luke ix. 28	58, 116, 516*, 563
Luke viii. 9	270, 299	Luke ix. 31	70
Luke viii. 12	287	Luke ix. 32	83, 340
Luke viii. 13	405*	Luke ix. 33	66, 319
Luke viii. 14	369	Luke ix. 34	431*
Luke viii. 15	524	Luke ix. 36	76, 158, 385
Luke viii. 16	376	Luke ix. 37	367, 523
Luke viii. 17	300, 307*, 481	Luke ix. 39	427
Luke viii. 18	306, 490*, 613*	Luke ix. 40	70, 336
Luke viii. 19	70	Luke ix. 41	83
Luke viii. 20	588*	Luke ix. 42	544
Luke viii. 21	105	Luke ix. 45	370, 459*
Luke viii. 22	285, 519	Luke ix. 46	244, 308, 413
Luke viii. 23	270	Luke ix. 47	202, 395
Luke viii. 24	128, 610	Luke ix. 49	393*
Luke viii. 25	445	Luke ix. 50	168
Luke viii. 28	198, 585	Luke ix. 51	150, 606
Luke viii. 29	63, 218*	Luke ix. 52	318, 594*, 607
Luke viii. 30	514	Luke ix. 54	285*, 431, 595
Luke viii. 31	336	Luke ix. 57	807
Luke viii. 32	311, 634	Luke ix. 61	362, 629
Luke viii. 34	416*	Luke ix. 62	213, 430
Luke viii. 37	515		
Luke viii. 38	514	Luke x. 1	70, 150, 249, 398, 472*, 527, 529
Luke viii. 39	400	Luke x. 2	270, 338, 559
Luke viii. 40	259	Luke x. 4	43, 493, 501
Luke viii. 41	268, 270	Luke x. 6	428, 429, 583
Luke viii. 43	213, 386, 499	Luke x. 7	86, 106, 366*
Luke viii. 46	346	Luke x. 8	306, 310, 579*
Luke viii. 47	301	Luke x. 9	407*
Luke viii. 48	549	Luke x. 11	253
Luke viii. 51	499	Luke x. 13	516*
Luke viii. 52	222, 268	Luke x. 18	269
Luke viii. 53	268	Luke x. 19	274*, 499, 507
Luke viii. 54	182, 183, 202	Luke x. 20	232, 387*, 495*, 497
		Luke x. 21	126, 209
Luke ix. 1	577	Luke x. 23	153
Luke ix. 3	316*, 398, 488, 489	Luke x. 24	153*, 330
Luke ix. 4	314	Luke x. 28	436
Luke ix. 5	480	Luke x. 29	130*, 437
Luke ix. 6	400	Luke x. 30	67, 344, 432, 543
Luke ix. 7	61, 123	Luke x. 32	400, 571
Luke ix. 9	153*	Luke x. 34	205, 428
Luke ix. 12	251*, 515	Luke x. 35	46, 143, 307

Luke x. 36	130*, 396, 430	Luke xii. 12	133
Luke x. 37	376, 456	Luke xii. 13	376
Luke x. 40	85, 396, 406, 432	Luke xii. 14	228, 409
Luke x. 41	610	Luke xii. 15	223, 367
Luke x. 42	246*, 427, 456	Luke xii. 16	71, 78, 602
		Luke xii. 17	57, 472
Luke xi. 1	117, 440	Luke xii. 18	155, 472*
Luke xi. 2	309	Luke xii. 19	396
Luke xi. 3	97*	Luke xii. 20	183, 218, 256*, 522*, 588
Luke xi. 4	111	Luke xii. 21	397
Luke xi. 5	169, 280*, 286	Luke xii. 24	94
Luke xi. 6	367*	Luke xii. 26	478*, 490
Luke xi. 7	415	Luke xii. 27	493
Luke xi. 8	363, 45, 200*, 330, 479	Luke xii. 29	437
Luke xi. 10	111	Luke xii. 30	155, 456, 548*, 549
Luke xi. 11	512, 568*	Luke xii. 32	183
Luke xi. 12	295*	Luke xii. 35	155
Luke xi. 13	629*	Luke xii. 36	176, 367*
Luke xi. 17	41, 173	Luke xii. 37	607, 608*
Luke xi. 18	445*	Luke xii. 42	410
Luke xi. 19	152	Luke xii. 44	393, 410
Luke xi. 20	292	Luke xii. 45	552, 614
Luke xi. 22	31, 233	Luke xii. 46	422
Luke xi. 24	483*	Luke xii. 47	162, 226, 405, 483*, 589*
Luke xi. 28	559	Luke xii. 48	164, 229, 522
Luke xi. 29	189*	Luke xii. 49	143*, 448*
Luke xi. 31	67	Luke xii. 50	297
Luke xi. 33	238*	Luke xii. 51	442*
Luke xi. 34	143	Luke xii. 53	392*
Luke xi. 35	503	Luke xii. 54	116*, 265
Luke xi. 36	308	Luke xii. 58	427, 454, 502*
Luke xi. 37	74, 338	Luke xii. 59	506*
Luke xi. 39	128, 201, 522		
Luke xi. 42	128, 251	Luke xiii. 1	376, 623*
Luke xi. 44	84	Luke xiii. 2	240, 271*, 404*, 508
Luke xi. 46	226	Luke xiii. 4	385*
Luke xi. 48	445, 457*, 558	Luke xiii. 7	169
Luke xi. 49	396, 589	Luke xiii. 8	297, 406
Luke xi. 50	123, 387, 410, 459	Luke xiii. 9	296*, 583, 600*
Luke xi. 51	129	Luke xiii. 11	250, 424*, 486
Luke xi. 52	65, 74	Luke xiii. 12	183, 271
Luke xi. 53	593*	Luke xiii. 13	73
		Luke xiii. 14	58, 218
Luke xii. 1	386*	Luke xiii. 15	129
Luke xii. 2	441*, 481	Luke xiii. 16	197, 218, 250, 563
Luke xii. 3	364*	Luke xiii. 17	429
Luke xii. 4	83, 162*	Luke xiii. 18	456
Luke xii. 5	299, 329, 429	Luke xiii. 19	125, 514
Luke xii. 6	172*, 510	Luke xiii. 22	256, 400
Luke xii. 8	57, 144, 226*, 455*	Luke xiii. 23	509
Luke xii. 9	259	Luke xiii. 24	563
Luke xii. 10	222, 397	Luke xiii. 27	110, 427
Luke xii. 11	128, 299, 407, 427*	Luke xiii. 28	75, 88, 309

Luke xiii. 29	60	Luke xvi. 11	549
Luke xiii. 32	590	Luke xvi. 12	550
Luke xiii. 33	590	Luke xvi. 13	64, 173, 332
Luke xiii. 34	83, 152, 330, 407	Luke xvi. 14	134, 343
Luke xiii. 35	296, 298*, 456, 506, 508, 528	Luke xvi. 16	422
		Luke xvi. 18	122*
Luke xiv. 1	218	Luke xvi. 19	229
Luke xiv. 3	128	Luke xvi. 20	72, 273*
Luke xiv. 4	143, 202, 521	Luke xvi. 21	201
Luke xiv. 5	169, 632	Luke xvi. 22	176, 323
Luke xiv. 7	268*, 593, 602	Luke xvi. 23	176*, 344
Luke xiv. 8	459, 503	Luke xvi. 24	201
Luke xiv. 10	69, 74, 428, 459*	Luke xvi. 25	76
Luke xiv. 12	488, 497	Luke xvi. 26	109, 287, 393*, 477, 629
Luke xiv. 16	69	Luke xvi. 29	67
Luke xiv. 18	276*, 423, 545, 591*	Luke xvi. 31	123, 477
Luke xiv. 19	259, 276*		
Luke xiv. 20	84	Luke xvii. 1	338, 482*
Luke xiv. 21	128, 520	Luke xvii. 2	241*, 337, 432, 632
Luke xiv. 23	127	Luke xvii. 4	82, 203, 233
Luke xiv. 24	198, 482	Luke xvii. 6	304
Luke xiv. 26	126, 479	Luke xvii. 7	74
Luke xiv. 27	480	Luke xvii. 8	88, 89, 168, 297*
Luke xiv. 30	333	Luke xvii. 10	308*
Luke xiv. 31	41, 384	Luke xvii. 11	112, 385
Luke xiv. 32	465	Luke xvii. 12	207
Luke xiv. 35	213*, 488	Luke xvii. 15	377
		Luke xvii. 16	122
Luke xv. 2	426	Luke xvii. 17	510
Luke xv. 4	297, 407	Luke xvii. 18	511*, 616*
Luke xv. 6	128, 256*	Luke xvii. 22	45, 296
Luke xv. 9	128, 256*	Luke xvii. 23	488, 501, 522
Luke xv. 14	63, 400*	Luke xvii. 24	366, 407, 591
Luke xv. 15	632	Luke xvii. 25	371
Luke xv. 16	198*, 201, 370	Luke xvii. 28	71, 268
Luke xv. 17	201, 558	Luke xvii. 31	578
Luke xv. 18	58, 608*	Luke xvii. 32	205
Luke xv. 19	319, 337, 615	Luke xvii. 33	310
Luke xv. 23	90	Luke xvii. 34	116, 173, 266*
Luke xv. 24	87		
Luke xv. 25	121, 199	Luke xviii. 1	329*
Luke xv. 26	117, 169, 299	Luke xviii. 2	116, 221
Luke xv. 28	270, 330, 456	Luke xviii. 3	621
Luke xv. 29	125*, 230	Luke xviii. 4	444, 479, 595
Luke xv. 30	155	Luke xviii. 6	237
		Luke xviii. 7	207, 212, 393, 494*, 506,
Luke xvi. 2	76, 143, 521, 602, 614, 628*	" " "	508, 553
Luke xvi. 3	227, 346*, 427	Luke xviii. 8	510*
Luke xvi. 4	196, 589	Luke xviii. 9	109, 301
Luke xvi. 6	155, 188	Luke xviii. 10	173
Luke xvi. 8	203*, 237, 238, 240, 598*	Luke xviii. 11	58, 183, 440
Luke xvi. 9	367	Luke xviii. 12	203, 274*
Luke xvi. 10	59	Luke xviii. 13	330, 430, 500
Luke xv. 7	241*		

Luke xviii. 14	241*	Luke xx. 14	287
Luke xviii. 15	108	Luke xx. 16	500
Luke xviii. 17	506	Luke xx. 19	405
Luke xviii. 18	551	Luke xx. 20	128, 202*, 321
Luke xviii. 21	253	Luke xx. 22	509
Luke xviii. 25	319	Luke xx. 24	313, 582
Luke xviii. 27	116	Luke xx. 25	109
Luke xviii. 29	482, 519	Luke xx. 26	202, 232
Luke xviii. 30	506, 508	Luke xx. 27	532*, 604
Luke xviii. 31	211*	Luke xx. 34	92
Luke xviii. 34	147*, 227	Luke xx. 35	133, 200, 609*
Luke xviii. 35	67, 404	Luke xx. 36	490*, 491
Luke xviii. 36	299	Luke xx. 37	63
Luke xviii. 39	150	Luke xx. 40	456, 499
Luke xviii. 40	207	Luke xx. 42	81, 112
		Luke xx. 43	527, 605
Luke xix. 1	431	Luke xx. 46	468*
Luke xix. 2	149, 150, 160*	Luke xx. 47	86
Luke xix. 3	70, 268, 371, 626		
Luke xix. 4	207, 288, 429, 590, 603, 632*	Luke xxi. 3	242
Luke xix. 5	333	Luke xxi. 4	340
Luke xix. 7	395*	Luke xxi. 6	392, 574*
Luke xix. 8	65	Luke xxi. 8	504
Luke xix. 11	468	Luke xxi. 11	439, 637
Luke xix. 13	125	Luke xxi. 12	84
Luke xix. 14	206	Luke xxi. 14	481
Luke xix. 15	152, 275, 628	Luke xxi. 16	589
Luke xix. 16	72	Luke xxi. 18	364, 506
Luke xix. 17	79	Luke xxi. 19	274*, 313
Luke xix. 23	303*	Luke xxi. 21	147*
Luke xix. 27	206, 330	Luke xxi. 22	325
Luke xix. 28	428	Luke xxi. 23	128
Luke xix. 29	182	Luke xxi. 24	297, 348*
Luke xix. 35	155	Luke xxi. 25	65, 120, 121, 552
Luke xix. 36	384	Luke xxi. 26	371, 420*, 430
Luke xix. 37	163, 164, 373, 395*, 516, 526	Luke xxi. 28	614
Luke xix. 39	85	Luke xxi. 30	372, 594*
Luke xix. 40	87, 279*	Luke xxi. 33	506
Luke xix. 41	222, 408	Luke xxi. 34	83, 464
Luke xix. 42	125, 197, 227, 438, 599*	Luke xxi. 37	415
Luke xix. 43	436		
Luke xix. 44	364*	Luke xxii. 1	531
Luke xix. 46	228	Luke xxii. 2	109, 299
Luke xix. 47	550	Luke xxii. 6	324
Luke xix. 48	71, 87, 299, 429	Luke xxii. 9	285
		Luke xxii. 10	207
Luke xx. 2	85, 441, 602	Luke xxii. 11	603
Luke xx. 4	420, 509	Luke xxii. 14	74, 519
Luke xx. 7	481	Luke xxii. 15	329, 339, 466*
Luke xx. 9	230	Luke xxii. 16	297, 499, 506, 508
Luke xx. 10	124, 199	Luke xxii. 18	199
Luke xx. 11	468*	Luke xxii. 19	116, 153*, 382
Luke xx. 12	105, 468	Luke xxii. 20	403, 411, 513, 634, 635*

Luke xxii. 21	374	Luke xxiii. 39	175
Luke xxii. 23	109, 299*, 445, 543	Luke xxiii. 40	112
Luke xxii. 24	244, 613*	Luke xxiii. 41	159, 562*
Luke xxii. 26	587*	Luke xxiii. 42	205, 413
Luke xxii. 27	129, 169	Luke xxiii. 44	43, 436*
Luke xxii. 30	86, 289	Luke xxiii. 45	131*
Luke xxii. 31	325, 610	Luke xxiii. 46	125
Luke xxii. 32	89, 336	Luke xxiii. 48	344, 409
Luke xxii. 33	319, 420	Luke xxiii. 50	524, 528
Luke xxii. 34	507	Luke xxiii. 51	146*, 348, 421, 563
Luke xxii. 35	43, 201	Luke xxiii. 53	499
Luke xxii. 36	43, 582*	Luke xxiii. 56	276
Luke xxii. 37	109, 513		
Luke xxii. 40	375*	Luke xxiv. 1	207, 248, 275
Luke xxii. 41,	71, 230*, 427	Luke xxiv. 2	362, 364*, 369
Luke xxii. 42	76, 432, 600	Luke xxiv. 4	174
Luke xxii. 44	431	Luke xxiv. 5	175, 376
Luke xxii. 45	371	Luke xxiv. 10	131, 190
Luke xxii. 47	432	Luke xxiv. 11	233, 514
Luke xxii. 49	62, 279*, 341, 388, 509	Luke xxiv. 13	348, 557
Luke xxii. 50	118	Luke xxiv. 14	212, 268
Luke xxii. 51	201	Luke xxiv. 15	112, 150
Luke xxii. 52	74, 377, 407	Luke xxiv. 16	326
Luke xxii. 53	155, 207	Luke xxiv. 18	57, 103, 112, 630
Luke xxii. 57	183	Luke xxiv. 19	523, 552
Luke xxii. 58	178*	Luke xxiv. 20	449
Luke xxii. 59	463	Luke xxiv. 21	114, 254*, 391*, 444, 559, 625
Luke xxii. 61	430, 602	Luke xxiv. 23	484
Luke xxii. 66	275	Luke xxiv. 25	183, 230, 324
Luke xxii. 68	506	Luke xxiv. 27	268, 370, 420, 633*
		Luke xxiv. 28	472
Luke xxiii. 1	113, 515, 516	Luke xxiv. 29	121, 325, 405*
Luke xxiii. 2	203, 604	Luke xxiv. 30	71
Luke xxiii. 4	128	Luke xxiv. 31	370
Luke xxiii. 5	621*	Luke xxiv. 32	268, 348
Luke xxiii. 6	113, 298	Luke xxiv. 35	219, 386
Luke xxiii. 7	67, 428	Luke xxiv. 36	150
Luke xxiii. 8	367*	Luke xxiv. 37	350
Luke xxiii. 9	261	Luke xxiv. 39	63, 552*
Luke xxiii. 11	428	Luke xxiv. 41	371
Luke xxiii. 12	129, 350*, 376, 405, 439,	Luke xxiv. 42	199
" " "	467, 518	Luke xxiv. 46	123, 231*
Luke xxiii. 13	113	Luke xxiv. 47	213, 393, 396, 624*
Luke xxiii. 14	180, 203, 431	Luke xxiv. 49	297
Luke xxiii. 15	219	Luke xxiv. 50	143, 603, 607*
Luke xxiii. 26	121, 430	Luke xxiv. 51	428
Luke xxiii. 28	183, 222, 408	Luke xxiv. 52	210
Luke xxiii. 31	218, 285, 550	Luke xxiv. 53	349
Luke xxiii. 32	530*		
Luke xxiii. 33	122, 552	John i. 1	122*, 181, 365, 405, 551
Luke xxiii. 34	168	John i. 2	122, 124
Luke xxiii. 35	253	John i. 3	173, 379*, 610
Luke xxiii. 38	392	John i. 4	114

John i. 5	270	John ii. 10	110, 152, 524
John i. 6	149, 350, 865*, 585	John ii. 11	61, 110
John i. 7	458*	John ii. 12	143, 230, 519
John i. 8	114, 316*, 317*	John ii. 13	539
John i. 9	132, 349*	John ii. 14	106, 128, 539
John i. 10	609	John ii. 15	429, 439, 539, 559
John i. 11	592*	John ii. 16	314, 539
John i. 12	134	John ii. 17	89, 185
John i. 13	177*, 488	John ii. 18	445*
John i. 14	122, 193, 201, 564*, 617*, 630	John ii. 19	312, 385*, 537
John i. 15	222, 244*, 274	John ii. 20	71, 218, 250
John i. 16	364*, 437*	John ii. 21	531
John i. 17	379*, 639	John ii. 22	123, 163, 627*
John i. 18	160, 341, 413, 415*	John ii. 23	67, 68, 155, 385, 410, 638
John i. 19	438*	John ii. 24	143, 638
John i. 20	479, 545, 610	John ii. 25	115*, 339
John i. 21	106, 114, 476		
John i. 22	620	John iii. 1	366, 563, 585
John i. 25	479*, 488, 491	John iii. 2	84, 122, 527
John i. 26	217, 261, 412*, 537	John iii. 3	537
John i. 27	335, 337	John iii. 4	331, 537
John i. 28	61	John iii. 5	537, 630
John i. 29	266	John iii. 6	178, 639
John i. 30	153, 244*	John iii. 8	298, 472, 510, 543
John i. 31	217, 561	John iii. 9	537
John i. 32	121, 266, 573	John iii. 10	114, 115*, 537
John i. 33	408, 412*, 573	John iii. 11	437, 517, 561
John i. 34	273*	John iii. 12	235*, 478
John i. 36	430	John iii. 13	341*, 431, 537
John i. 38	537	John iii. 14	106*, 540
John i. 39	105, 563	John iii. 16	133, 172*, 281, 301, 610
John i. 40	230, 268, 298, 537	John iii. 17	537, 540
John i. 41	64	John iii. 18	272, 273, 474*, 480
John i. 42	154, 537, 563	John iii. 19	129, 155, 630
John i. 43	60, 153, 430	John iii. 20	111, 639
John i. 44	266, 313, 537, 563	John iii. 21	122, 155, 639
John i. 45	61	John iii. 22	268, 376, 539, 593*
John i. 46	133, 267, 537, 546	John iii. 23	144, 471, 514
John i. 47	86, 551	John iii. 25	368
John i. 49	329, 341, 372, 537, 551	John iii. 26	212*
John i. 50	114	John iii. 27	499
John i. 51	162, 239	John iii. 29	79, 199, 466*
John i. 52	537, 553	John iii. 30	332, 537
		John iii. 31	537
John ii. 1	61, 187, 540	John iii. 32	437, 537
John ii. 2	519, 540	John iii. 33	155, 537
John ii. 3	540	John iii. 34	424*, 543
John ii. 4	211, 274, 537, 585	John iii. 35	414
John ii. 5	307	John iii. 36	266*
John ii. 6	398*, 401, 402, 523		
John ii. 7	201, 313, 537, 539	John iv. 1	144*, 239, 268, 540
John ii. 8	313, 314, 537, 540	John iv. 2	150, 444
John ii. 9	85, 198, 268, 274, 343, 540	John iv. 4	283*, 540

John iv. 5	113, 396, 444, 471, 540	John v. 4	413*
John iv. 6	134, 367*, 392*, 540, 541, 562,	John v. 5	59, 230*, 250, 256*
" " "	618*	John v. 6	537
John iv. 7	537	John v. 7	372, 386, 537, 599*
John iv. 8	288, 562	John v. 8	314, 537
John iv. 9	88, 152, 365, 523, 537	John v. 9	539
John iv. 10	152*, 537, 562	John v. 10	331, 340
John iv. 11	132, 494*, 524, 537	John v. 11	64, 160, 228, 314
John iv. 12	239, 519	John v. 12	135
John iv. 14	199, 397*, 507	John v. 13	91, 268, 341
John iv. 15	318, 488, 537	John v. 14	501
John iv. 16	537	John v. 15	64, 268
John iv. 17	537	John v. 16	268
John iv. 18	110, 464*	John v. 18	154, 268
John iv. 19	537, 551	John v. 19	261, 306, 307, 543
John iv. 20	384	John v. 20	242, 287
John iv. 21	183, 265, 296, 537	John v. 21	123, 440, 541
John iv. 22	480, 538	John v. 22	131, 548*
John iv. 23	111, 210, 420*, 424*, 448, 528	John v. 23	475
John iv. 24	538, 551	John v. 24	273*
John iv. 25	308, 537	John v. 25	199, 296
John iv. 26	537, 582	John v. 26	266
John iv. 27	376, 393*, 539	John v. 27	439*
John iv. 28	396, 444	John v. 28	82
John iv. 29	114, 511	John v. 29	188, 354
John iv. 30	86	John v. 30	495, 496, 499
John iv. 31	268, 545, 592*	John v. 32	109, 225, 513
John iv. 33	511*	John v. 35	114, 405, 614
John iv. 34	337*, 338, 537	John v. 36	133*, 245*
John iv. 35	313, 539, 589, 626, 641*	John v. 37	488, 489
John iv. 36	133, 459*	John v. 38	489*
John iv. 37	114, 363	John v. 39	114
John iv. 38	272	John v. 41	365
John iv. 39	134, 540, 550	John v. 42	185, 263, 482, 626
John iv. 40	177, 296, 335, 540	John v. 43	390, 494, 537
John iv. 41	540, 619	John v. 44	152, 331*, 464*, 573, 578
John iv. 42	114, 435, 540, 619*	John v. 45	109, 233, 273*, 537
John iv. 43	106	John v. 46	363, 66, 304
John iv. 44	447, 454*	John v. 47	285, 292, 477, 478
John iv. 45	134, 275, 410		
John iv. 46	61, 275	John vi. 1	191*, 207
John iv. 47	70, 155, 274, 336	John vi. 2	375*, 515
John iv. 48	65, 506, 507*	John vi. 3	106, 428, 456
John iv. 49	79, 330*	John vi. 5	268, 279, 287, 607
John iv. 50	163, 537	John vi. 6	150, 564
John iv. 51	207	John vi. 7	335, 337
John iv. 52	230	John vi. 9	117, 141, 169
John iv. 53	422, 519, 582	John vi. 10	73, 74, 230*, 313, 443, 452*, 456*
John iv. 54	604	John vi. 13	132, 201, 208, 514
		John vi. 14	114
John v. 1	118, 125*	John vi. 15	228, 607
John v. 2	112, 267*, 392*, 592*	John vi. 16	273
John v. 3	128, 520	John vi. 17	86, 429, 494, 596*

John vi. 18	435	John vii. 14	270
John vi. 19	230, 250, 374*, 471	John vii. 15	340, 483*, 496
John vi. 21	268, 330, 375*, 467*, 614	John vii. 16	496*
John vi. 22	79, 131, 275, 568*	John vii. 17	107, 293, 332, 373, 509, 537,
John vi. 23	564*	" " "	541, 614
John vi. 24	57, 268	John vii. 18	537
John vi. 26	496	John vii. 19	271, 508
John vi. 27	496*, 528, 534	John vii. 21	59*, 117
John vi. 29	57, 159, 166, 338, 628	John vii. 22	271, 368, 421, 597
John vi. 30	152	John vii. 23	459*, 508
John vi. 31	106*, 588*	John vii. 24	224, 314
John vi. 32	276	John vii. 26	511
John vi. 33	343	John vii. 27	298, 442, 510, 626
John vi. 35	77, 506, 639	John vii. 28	437
John vi. 36	439*	John vii. 30	437
John vi. 37	178	John vii. 31	58, 163, 511*
John vi. 38	287	John vii. 32	288
John vi. 39	63, 574, 589	John vii. 34	53, 552
John vi. 40	144, 338	John vii. 35	187*, 300*, 472, 511
John vi. 41	343, 431	John vii. 36	53, 494
John vi. 42	159	John vii. 37	77, 293, 525
John vi. 43	376	John vii. 38	89, 550, 574
John vi. 45	175, 189*	John vii. 39	163
John vi. 46	597	John vii. 40	107
John vi. 50	114, 199, 343, 366, 630	John vii. 41	447*
John vi. 51	86, 87, 114, 343, 443	John vii. 42	265, 411
John vi. 52	212	John vii. 43	399
John vi. 54	552	John vii. 44	330, 437
John vi. 55	465*	John vii. 45	157*, 632
John vi. 56	552	John vii. 48	442, 366, 420
John vi. 57	399*, 440, 549	John vii. 49	442, 484, 486*, 515
John vi. 58	86, 198	John vii. 51	267, 523*, 588
John vi. 60	551	John vii. 52	265, 266, 311*
John vi. 62	159, 600*		
John vi. 63	114, 499, 538, 609	John viii. 3	123
John vi. 64	124, 268, 475*, 543	John viii. 4	72
John vi. 65	368	John viii. 6	268
John vi. 66	367, 550	John viii. 7	394, 467
John vi. 68	279, 549	John viii. 8	268
John vi. 69	553*	John viii. 9	249, 621
John vi. 70	436*	John viii. 12	506, 513
John vi. 71	70, 190	John viii. 14	267, 441, 472
		John viii. 15	583*
John vii. 1	268	John viii. 16	293, 558
John vii. 2	528	John viii. 18	538
John vii. 3	79	John viii. 19	304, 488
John vii. 4	292, 630*	John viii. 20	275, 385*, 480
John vii. 6	132	John viii. 21	387, 388
John vii. 7	614*	John viii. 22	253, 511*
John vii. 8	596*	John viii. 23	109
John vii. 10	541, 617	John viii. 25	46, 167*, 230, 438, 457, 464*
John vii. 12	105	" " "	549
John vii. 13	185*	John viii. 26	416, 442, 451

John viii. 27	222	John ix. 41	304
John viii. 29	277*		
John viii. 33	271	John x. 1	483
John viii. 36	295	John x. 3	154, 537, 540
John viii. 37	413, 414*, 480	John x. 4	514, 537
John viii. 38	455*	John x. 5	84, 223, 507, 610
John viii. 39	305	John x. 6	168, 298*
John viii. 40	199*, 272, 528	John x. 7	114, 187*
John viii. 41	538	John x. 8	372, 514
John viii. 42	304	John x. 9	540
John viii. 44	114*, 138, 145*, 308, 467*	John x. 10	606
John viii. 45	457	John x. 11	106*, 132, 524, 539
John viii. 51	293, 506	John x. 12	514, 540
John viii. 52	506, 519	John x. 13	206, 373
John viii. 53	545, 577*		
John viii. 54	293, 574*, 626	John x. 15	382, 440
John viii. 55	195*, 209, 482	John x. 16	520
John viii. 56	339*	John x. 17	537
John viii. 58	267, 330, 523	John x. 18	370
John viii. 59	253*, 469*	John x. 19	399
		John x. 20	456
John ix. 1	139, 367	John x. 21	333, 514
John ix. 2	58, 459*, 545	John x. 22	112
John ix. 3	177, 316, 317*, 488, 514	John x. 23	67, 385
John ix. 4	296, 297, 332, 481	John x. 25	437, 514
John ix. 5	144, 609	John x. 27	514
John ix. 6	427	John x. 28	83, 506
John ix. 7	413, 415*, 563	John x. 29	143, 144, 242
John ix. 8	114, 268	John x. 30	152, 518
John ix. 9	209	John x. 32	265*, 368, 412, 525
John ix. 10	72	John x. 33	152, 228, 412
John ix. 11	155, 415*, 427, 456	John x. 35	478
John ix. 13	58, 267, 528	John x. 36	580
John ix. 14	72, 443	John x. 37	478*
John ix. 15	298	John x. 38	553
John ix. 17	83, 550	John x. 41	144
John ix. 18	275, 296		
John ix. 19	114	John xi. 1	364*, 370, 411*
John ix. 20	114	John xi. 2	227, 343*, 562
John ix. 21	83, 150, 152, 155, 298	John xi. 3	543
John ix. 22	254, 262, 294, 336	John xi. 4	383*, 405
John ix. 24	153	John xi. 5	268, 443
John ix. 25	298*, 341*	John xi. 6	159, 165, 230, 541, 576
John ix. 26	155, 456	John xi. 7	608
John ix. 27	331	John xi. 8	436, 472
John ix. 28	222	John xi. 11	608*
John ix. 29	66	John xi. 12	292
John ix. 30	72, 184*, 446*	John xi. 13	531
John ix. 31	160, 199, 549	John xi. 15	80, 339*, 459*
John ix. 33	70, 305*, 477, 499	John xi. 18	112, 195, 372, 471, 557*
John ix. 36	437, 620*	John xi. 19	275
John ix. 37	273, 274*, 540	John xi. 21	304
John ix. 38	105, 210	John xi. 25	87, 114, 513

John xi. 26	506	John xii. 36	238
John xi. 27	273	John xii. 40	155, 459, 494, 522*, 588
John xi. 30	275, 456, 563*	John xii. 41	457
John xi. 31	341, 626	John xii. 42	444
John xi. 32	155, 159*, 304	John xii. 43	241*
John xi. 33	215*, 527	John xii. 44	456, 496, 497
John xi. 37	70, 149, 337	John xii. 46	527
John xi. 38	396*, 430	John xii. 47	144
John xi. 39	313	John xii. 48	160, 483
John xi. 40	76	John xii. 49	611
John xi. 41	396		
John xi. 44	229, 278*, 313, 552	John xiii. 1	155, 339, 344, 372, 396, 460,
John xi. 45	168	" " "	531, 572, 638
		John xiii. 2	252*
John xi. 47	128, 284*	John xiii. 3	272
John xi. 48	155, 192, 607*	John xiii. 4	176*, 267*
John xi. 49	118, 170*, 341	John xiii. 5	106, 614*
John xi. 50	382	John xiii. 6	549, 88, 265*, 444, 508
John xi. 51	70, 71, 562	John xiii. 7	543
John xi. 52	577	John xiii. 8	506
John xi. 54	421	John xiii. 9	552, 582
John xi. 55	539	John xiii. 10	508
John xi. 56	506, 508*	John xiii. 11	353, 562
John xi. 57	72, 275, 294, 336	John xiii. 12	271, 275
		John xiii. 14	88, 292, 528, 549
John xii. 1	123, 557*	John xiii. 16	239, 242, 488
John xii. 2	268, 593*	John xiii. 17	296*, 612
John xii. 3	97*, 201*, 525*, 606	John xiii. 18	316, 317*, 430, 620
John xii. 5	116, 621*	John xiii. 22	233, 268
John xii. 6	116, 206, 268	John xiii. 24	308*, 318
John xii. 7	274*	John xiii. 25	407*
John xii. 8	150	John xiii. 27	243*, 265, 311*
John xii. 9	123, 515	John xiii. 28	405*, 626
John xii. 10	254*, 336	John xiii. 29	158*, 313, 559, 577, 580
John xii. 11	191, 550	John xiii. 31	277*
John xii. 12	106, 515, 526	John xiii. 32	292*
John xii. 13	270, 603*	John xiii. 33	440
John xii. 15	549	John xiii. 34	336, 464*, 524*, 550
John xii. 16	393, 541	John xiii. 35	173, 386
John xii. 17	123, 270		
John xii. 18	334, 347, 515	John xiv. 1	817, 501
John xii. 20	353, 593*	John xiv. 3	265
John xii. 21	331, 370	John xiv. 7	273*, 304
John xii. 23	261, 339*, 460*	John xiv. 9	549
John xii. 25	83	John xiv. 11	585
John xii. 26	265	John xiv. 15	314
John xii. 27	442	John xiv. 16	530
John xii. 28	582*, 586	John xiv. 17	488
John xii. 29	334, 522	John xiv. 19	585
John xii. 32	86, 291	John xiv. 21	114
John xii. 33	70, 226	John xiv. 22	562
John xii. 34	261	John xiv. 23	256
John xii. 35	296, 538	John xiv. 24	475

John xiv. 26	227, 609	John xvi. 31	508
John xiv. 27	186, 609, 639	John xvi. 32	339, 460, 516*
John xiv. 28	304* 513	John xvi. 33	291
John xiv. 30	60, 218, 436, 437		
John xiv. 31	285	John xvñ. 2	75, 79, 145, 185*, 289
		John xvñ. 3	161, 290, 337, 388, 525
John xv. 1	132	John xvñ. 4	276*
John xv. 2	58, 111, 148, 343*, 483, 587, 574	John xvñ. 5	163
John xv. 3	399, 537	John xvñ. 6	76
John xv. 4	314, 384, 471, 587, 541, 582	John xvñ. 7	76
John xv. 5	471*, 499*, 537, 578, 582	John xvñ. 8	553
John xv. 6	141, 277*, 298, 522, 537, 632*	John xvñ. 9	159, 166, 421
John xv. 7	310, 537	John xvñ. 10	273*, 389*, 389, 562
John xv. 8	161, 278*, 337*, 338*, 537	John xvñ. 11	163, 183, 265
John xv. 9	537, 541	John xvñ. 12	508
John xv. 10	153*, 537	John xvñ. 14	272
John xv. 11	137, 537	John xvñ. 15	336, 410
John xv. 12	537	John xvñ. 17	538
John xv. 13	338, 537, 539, 595*	John xvñ. 18	277*, 440
John xv. 14	537	John xvñ. 22	274*, 582
John xv. 15	637, 619	John xvñ. 23	583
John xv. 16	78, 537, 607	John xvñ. 24	123, 265
John xv. 17	386, 537	John xvñ. 25	439
John xv. 18	537	John xvñ. 26	225
John xv. 19	304, 439, 537, 609		
John xv. 20	163, 292*, 537	John xvñi. 1	67
John xv. 21	537	John xvñi. 2	113, 376
John xv. 22	77, 192*, 305*, 373, 477, 537, 595	John xvñi. 3	106, 368, 377, 471, 472*
John xv. 23	537	John xvñi. 5	113, 582
John xv. 24	77, 271, 489, 475, 537	John xvñi. 6	73, 109
John xv. 25	317*, 588, 620	John xvñi. 7	582
John xv. 26	141, 365, 429, 562	John xvñi. 10	98, 182, 559
John xv. 27	267, 443	John xvñi. 11	148*, 313, 512*
		John xvñi. 12	275*
John xvi. 2	265, 339, 451*, 460	John xvñi. 13	60
John xvi. 4	124	John xvñi. 14	319
John xvi. 7	320, 337	John xvñi. 15	519
John xvi. 8	421, 520	John xvñi. 16	395
John xvi. 11	273	John xvñi. 20	117, 610
John xvi. 12	332	John xvñi. 22	226
John xvi. 13	82, 308	John xvñi. 23	292
John xvi. 14	266	John xvñi. 24	275
John xvi. 15	266	John xvñi. 26	158, 159
John xvi. 17	75, 203, 265, 366*, 589	John xvñi. 28	267, 288
John xvi. 19	330	John xvñi. 30	304, 477
John xvi. 20	87, 90, 184	John xvñi. 31	581*
John xvi. 22	90, 558	John xvñi. 32	70, 226
John xvi. 23	227, 499	John xvñi. 34	151, 261
John xvi. 24	459, 499	John xvñi. 36	304
John xvi. 25	296, 481	John xvñi. 37	444, 457, 512*
John xvi. 26	373	John xvñi. 38	153
John xvi. 27	112, 150*, 365	John xvñi. 39	339
John xvi. 30	122, 339, 387*	John xvñi. 40	582

John xix. 2	226, 439	John xx. 26	123, 472, 537, 585
John xix. 3	77, 182	John xx. 27	610
John xix. 4	631	John xx. 28	183*
John xix. 5	564, 631*	John xx. 29	272*
John xix. 6	128, 610	John xx. 30	525
John xix. 7	228		
John xix. 9	267	John xxi. 1	191, 374*, 443
John xix. 10	508, 609	John xxi. 2	109, 190, 518, 520
John xix. 11	242, 305*	John xxi. 3	265, 284, 537
John xix. 12	429	John xxi. 4	85, 408
John xix. 14	124, 189*	John xxi. 5	511
John xix. 16	456	John xxi. 6	313, 371, 618
John xix. 18	374, 376	John xxi. 8	65, 188, 216, 370, 557, 562
John xix. 21	501	John xxi. 9	275
John xix. 22	271, 521	John xxi. 10	90, 199, 370, 589
John xix. 23	111, 176, 562	John xxi. 11	250, 341
John xix. 24	257, 285, 373, 502	John xxi. 12	613*
John xix. 25	60, 131*, 190, 394	John xxi. 13	607*
John xix. 26	183	John xxi. 14	123
John xix. 28	459*, 561	John xxi. 15	85, 190, 549
John xix. 29	201	John xxi. 16	313, 604
John xix. 30	271	John xxi. 17	545
John xix. 31	70, 514*, 561, 562, 563	John xxi. 18	253, 257, 268
John xix. 32	70, 115, 576	John xxi. 20	407*
John xix. 35	340	John xxi. 21	169, 550, 562, 586*
John xix. 36	162	John xxi. 22	55, 152, 296, 586
John xix. 37	158	John xxi. 23	265
John xix. 38	632	John xxi. 24	343, 517
John xix. 39	86	John xxi. 25	168, 333*, 482*, 525
John xix. 41	499, 524		
John xx. 1	106, 248, 343*, 366*, 396	Acts i. 1	183, 244, 256, 549, 559, 575*, 621*
John xx. 2	420, 522, 588*	Acts i. 2	164, 275, 542, 543, 556*
John xx. 3	270, 519	Acts i. 3	143, 188, 207, 575*
John xx. 4	69, 464, 604*	Acts i. 4	199, 545, 580
John xx. 6	267	Acts i. 5	161*, 216, 412*, 540
John xx. 7	376, 415*, 632	Acts i. 6	105, 509
John xx. 9	123, 274	Acts i. 7	195*, 441*
John xx. 11	395, 396	Acts i. 8	125*, 407, 420
John xx. 12	173, 384, 395, 591*	Acts i. 10	174, 175, 348, 438
John xx. 13	298	Acts i. 11	85, 110, 430, 523, 549, 610
John xx. 14	537	Acts i. 12	182*
John xx. 15	147*, 537, 632	Acts i. 13	113, 128, 131, 190, 518, 520
John xx. 16	537	Acts i. 14	122, 521
John xx. 17	201, 428, 537	Acts i. 15	250, 562, 563
John xx. 18	537	Acts i. 16	183, 523
John xx. 19	123, 159, 176, 234, 248, 267,	Acts i. 17	200*
" " "	185, 473*, 585	Acts i. 18	88, 206, 514
John xx. 21	271, 541, 585	Acts i. 19	112
John xx. 22	312	Acts i. 20	286, 435
John xx. 23	272, 291, 293	Acts i. 21	160, 407, 444, 624
John xx. 24	483	Acts i. 22	164, 621
John xx. 25	66	Acts i. 24	85, 152, 158*, 342*
		Acts i. 25	432, 631

Acts i. 26	408, 433*	Acts iii. 13	148, 149, 157*, 400, 575
Acts ii. 1	328, 539	Acts iii. 14	126, 523
Acts ii. 2	348, 539	Acts iii. 15	123
Acts ii. 3	516*, 539	Acts iii. 16	133, 144, 378, 394*
Acts ii. 4	539, 614	Acts iii. 17	402*
Acts ii. 5	370, 407	Acts iii. 18	606
Acts ii. 6	154, 516, 528	Acts iii. 19	310*, 462*
Acts ii. 9	112, 439	Acts iii. 20	462
Acts ii. 10	400, 439	Acts iii. 21	163, 462, 558
Acts ii. 11	345, 347	Acts iii. 22	82, 307, 401, 545
Acts ii. 12	303*, 516	Acts iii. 23	156, 307, 480
Acts ii. 14	183, 391, 610	Acts iii. 24	370, 633*
Acts ii. 17	77, 199, 370	Acts iii. 25	114, 163, 225
Acts ii. 18	77, 438	Acts iii. 26	134*, 329*
Acts ii. 19	531	Acts iv. 1	207, 427
Acts ii. 20	330, 396	Acts iv. 2	123, 133, 389
Acts ii. 22	379, 523	Acts iv. 3	396, 430, 590
Acts ii. 23	73, 148	Acts iv. 4	84, 276
Acts ii. 24	31	Acts iv. 5	146*, 323, 415, 590
Acts ii. 25	88, 397*	Acts iv. 7	390, 420, 527, 632*
Acts ii. 26	71, 425*	Acts iv. 9	185*, 448
Acts ii. 27	156, 592	Acts iv. 11	114, 157*
Acts ii. 28	201, 376*	Acts iv. 12	217*, 454*, 493
Acts ii. 29	113, 384, 549, 585	Acts iv. 13	268, 269*, 434, 544, 626
Acts ii. 30	226, 331, 455*, 603	Acts iv. 15	593*
Acts ii. 31	482, 592	Acts iv. 16	284, 331
Acts ii. 32	110	Acts iv. 17	393, 396, 466*, 481
Acts ii. 33	214*, 237*, 435, 531, 559	Acts iv. 18	344, 481, 488
Acts ii. 34	81, 215	Acts iv. 19	518
Acts ii. 36	111*	Acts iv. 20	475, 481, 498*
Acts ii. 37	435	Acts iv. 21	109, 299, 343*
Acts ii. 38	393*, 397, 587	Acts iv. 22	43, 196, 239, 531, 596
Acts ii. 39	307, 415*	Acts iv. 23	128
Acts ii. 40	545	Acts iv. 24	152, 404, 552
Acts ii. 41	433	Acts iv. 27	439, 518
Acts ii. 42	348	Acts iv. 29	45, 431
Acts ii. 43	65, 156, 211*, 379*, 439, 527	Acts iv. 33	78, 407, 435, 550
Acts ii. 45	306	Acts iv. 34	384
Acts ii. 46	198, 401*	Acts iv. 35	306, 403
Acts ii. 47	110*	Acts iv. 36	120, 230, 562
Acts iii. 1	408* 518	Acts v. 1	62, 171
Acts iii. 2	171, 227, 325, 354*, 522, 543	Acts v. 2	253, 57, 62, 90, 199
Acts iii. 3	270, 354, 543, 608, 609	Acts v. 4	212, 343*, 355, 495*, 497, 585
Acts iii. 4	233, 313	Acts v. 5	344, 408
Acts iii. 5	593	Acts v. 7	58, 483, 563
Acts iii. 6	211	Acts v. 8	206, 298
Acts iii. 7	192, 202*	Acts v. 10	342, 405
Acts iii. 8	553	Acts v. 12	65, 67, 363, 379, 564*, 607
Acts iii. 10	66, 392, 626	Acts v. 13	564
Acts iii. 11	67, 392, 394, 526	Acts v. 14	564*
Acts iii. 12	183, 261, 326*, 610, 617	Acts v. 15	374, 376, 400*, 431, 564*

Acts v. 16	516, 526	Acts vii. 27	71, 90, 269
Acts v. 17	520, 608	Acts vii. 29	121, 387*
Acts v. 19	176, 380	Acts vii. 30	106*
Acts v. 20	237*, 238*, 634	Acts vii. 32	114, 585
Acts v. 21	407*	Acts vii. 33	313
Acts v. 22	251*	Acts vii. 34	354
Acts v. 23	372, 472, 545, 604	Acts vii. 35	63, 67, 159
Acts v. 24	129, 275, 308, 439, 518	Acts vii. 36	121, 524
Acts v. 26	217, 288, 377, 505*	Acts vii. 37	82, 85
Acts v. 28	112, 201, 393, 408, 466, 481	Acts vii. 38	118, 421
Acts v. 29	332, 518, 520, 595*	Acts vii. 39	40, 71, 90
Acts v. 30	374	Acts vii. 40	67, 110, 148, 182, 300*
Acts v. 31	214*, 228, 318	Acts vii. 41	232
Acts v. 32	191*	Acts vii. 42	43, 175, 251, 469*, 512*
Acts v. 35	60, 392, 549, 557*, 610	Acts vii. 43	75, 210
Acts v. 36	170*, 184, 261, 433*	Acts vii. 44	66
Acts v. 37	106, 621	Acts vii. 45	71, 90, 174
Acts v. 38	296*, 427, 519	Acts vii. 46	71
Acts v. 39	122, 296*	Acts vii. 47	71
Acts v. 40	393	Acts vii. 48	554
Acts v. 42	345*, 435	Acts vii. 51	215, 440
Acts vi. 1	28, 268, 405	Acts vii. 53	328*, 398*
Acts vi. 2	85, 87	Acts vii. 58	254
Acts vi. 3	375	Acts vii. 59	549
Acts vi. 4	128	Acts vii. 60	226
Acts vi. 5	28, 103, 113, 120, 214, 233	Acts viii. 1	113, 133, 400, 443
Acts vi. 6	632	Acts viii. 2	256, 276, 443
Acts vi. 7	268, 435	Acts viii. 3	113, 443, 552
Acts vi. 8	113	Acts viii. 4	559
Acts vi. 9	112, 129*, 420	Acts viii. 5	113, 125, 145
Acts vi. 11	67	Acts viii. 6	113, 329, 435
Acts vi. 13	128, 382	Acts viii. 7	443, 584
Acts vii. 2	330, 341	Acts viii. 8	443
Acts vii. 3	429	Acts viii. 9	170*, 443
Acts vii. 4	329, 413, 415, 422	Acts viii. 10	114, 370
Acts vii. 5	276*, 331, 397	Acts viii. 11	218, 329, 334
Acts vii. 8	61, 113, 218	Acts viii. 12	113
Acts vii. 9	61, 376	Acts viii. 13	348, 435
Acts vii. 10	73, 138*, 228, 527	Acts viii. 14	259, 271
Acts vii. 11	407	Acts viii. 15	71, 122, 373
Acts vii. 12	63, 345, 347	Acts viii. 16	350*, 430, 499, 562
Acts vii. 14	113, 250, 391*	Acts viii. 17	122, 269
Acts vii. 15	519	Acts viii. 19	46, 158, 287, 307
Acts vii. 16	70, 90, 163, 190, 206	Acts viii. 20	286
Acts vii. 17	163	Acts viii. 21	211
Acts vii. 19	157, 326*, 329	Acts viii. 22	198, 300, 370, 445, 542, 622
Acts vii. 20	212, 248*	Acts viii. 24	158*, 166, 430, 477
Acts vii. 21	73, 143, 147, 228*, 528	Acts viii. 25	223
Acts vii. 22	227*	Acts viii. 26	119*, 121, 157*, 400
Acts vii. 24	258, 632*	Acts viii. 27	318, 341, 375, 593*
Acts vii. 26	48, 269, 341, 435	Acts viii. 28	348, 374, 435
		Acts viii. 30	510, 638

Acts viii. 31	295, 303*, 304, 335, 435, 447	Acts x. 16	422
Acts viii. 34	420	Acts x. 17	268, 308, 371*, 408, 438, 603
Acts viii. 35	71, 607*	Acts x. 18	208, 293, 543
Acts viii. 36	268, 400, 407, 604	Acts x. 20	41, 442, 451, 477
Acts viii. 38	528	Acts x. 21	564
Acts viii. 39	326, 415, 499	Acts x. 22	61, 138, 193, 322*, 434
Acts viii. 40	71, 415*, 616*, 621	Acts x. 23	253*
		Acts x. 24	348
Acts ix. 1	304*	Acts x. 25	328*
Acts ix. 2	106, 107, 195, 196, 227, 294,	Acts x. 26	153
" " "	326, 552, 559	Acts x. 28	435, 437, 449*, 481
Acts ix. 3	323, 366, 426, 432, 486	Acts x. 30	43, 80
Acts ix. 4	610	Acts x. 32	121, 138*, 404, 528
Acts ix. 6	41, 79, 168, 587*	Acts x. 33	345, 592
Acts ix. 7	44, 486	Acts x. 35	120, 574
Acts ix. 8	72, 113	Acts x. 36	149, 164, 564*, 574*
Acts ix. 9	486*, 488	Acts x. 37	382, 564*
Acts ix. 11	182, 313, 454*	Acts x. 38	227
Acts ix. 12	182, 430	Acts x. 39	163, 363, 439, 559, 560, 625*
Acts ix. 13	371, 549	Acts x. 41	122, 140, 171
Acts ix. 15	587	Acts x. 42	50, 532
Acts ix. 17	106, 287, 430, 562	Acts x. 45	424
Acts ix. 18	427, 439	Acts x. 47	386, 511
Acts ix. 20	268, 626	Acts x. 48	435
Acts ix. 21	114, 161, 270, 275, 288, 340,		
" " "	354, 457	Acts xi. 1	341, 400
Acts ix. 24	207, 435, 552	Acts xi. 5	42, 80, 635*
Acts ix. 26	268, 484	Acts xi. 6	270
Acts ix. 27	46, 202, 301	Acts xi. 8	441
Acts ix. 31	185, 210, 382, 420	Acts xi. 10	422
Acts ix. 32	61, 323	Acts xi. 11	408, 427
Acts ix. 33	367	Acts xi. 13	106, 435
Acts ix. 34	79, 594*	Acts xi. 14	152, 518
Acts ix. 35	61, 275	Acts xi. 15	124, 614*
Acts ix. 37	178*, 328	Acts xi. 16	205, 216, 412*, 602
Acts ix. 38	61, 471	Acts xi. 17	80, 443, 603, 628*
Acts ix. 39	253, 254, 376	Acts xi. 19	371, 372*, 392*
Acts ix. 40	105, 345	Acts xi. 20	268
Acts ix. 42	213*, 382	Acts xi. 21	435
Acts ix. 43	323	Acts xi. 22	133, 609*
		Acts xi. 23	335, 438
Acts x. 1	61, 62, 171	Acts xi. 24	524
Acts x. 3	230	Acts xi. 26	95, 323
Acts x. 4	632	Acts xi. 28	63, 75, 89, 334, 375*, 526
Acts x. 5	313, 396	Acts xi. 29	71, 516
Acts x. 6	121, 211, 395, 404	Acts xi. 30	606
Acts x. 7	145, 632*		
Acts x. 9	124, 407, 544	Acts xii. 1	113, 138, 540
Acts x. 10	146, 147, 330, 408, 430	Acts xii. 2	62, 216, 540
Acts x. 11	267, 376*, 635	Acts xii. 3	268, 468*, 540, 562, 563
Acts x. 13	586	Acts xii. 5	540
Acts x. 14	171, 441, 475, 499	Acts xii. 6	64, 177, 435, 539, 540
Acts x. 15	152, 543, 586, 604	Acts xii. 7	73, 79, 429, 539, 540

Acts xii. 8	314, 435, 539, 540	Acts xiii. 43	128, 542
Acts xii. 9	442, 539, 540	Acts xiii. 44	435
Acts xii. 10	72, 126, 132, 464, 540	Acts xiii. 45	355*
Acts xii. 11	73, 152, 540	Acts xiii. 46	151, 518, 539
Acts xii. 12	435, 539, 540	Acts xiii. 47	228, 259, 528
Acts xii. 13	540, 545	Acts xiii. 48	69, 262*, 543
Acts xii. 14	50, 371, 442, 540	Acts xiii. 49	378*
Acts xii. 15	540	Acts xiii. 50	126, 539
Acts xii. 16	345, 467*, 540, 544	Acts xiii. 51	342
Acts xii. 17	539, 540		
Acts xii. 18	45, 298, 301, 445, 540	Acts xiv. 1	301, 323, 401*, 559
Acts xii. 19	396, 415*, 437, 540	Acts xiv. 3	379
Acts xii. 20	371, 375, 410, 540	Acts xiv. 4	104, 391
Acts xii. 21	142*, 146, 218, 540	Acts xiv. 5	319, 560
Acts xii. 22	142, 540	Acts xiv. 8	73, 215
Acts xii. 23	540	Acts xiv. 9	324, 543
Acts xii. 24	539, 540	Acts xiv. 10	48, 82, 108, 464, 528, 553*
Acts xii. 25	518, 539, 544	Acts xiv. 11	431, 539
		Acts xiv. 12	66, 150*, 539
Acts xiii. 1	400, 520	Acts xiv. 13	90, 372, 630
Acts xiii. 2	262*, 313, 422	Acts xiv. 14	257, 344, 518
Acts xiii. 3	143, 521, 584*	Acts xiv. 15	209, 543, 552, 628
Acts xiii. 4	539	Acts xiv. 16	219
Acts xiii. 8	138, 561, 562, 563	Acts xiv. 17	78, 156, 201, 444*
Acts xiii. 9	107*	Acts xiv. 18	325
Acts xiii. 10	124, 183, 315, 345, 510*, 549	Acts xiv. 19	321, 344, 544
Acts xiii. 11	251, 268, 486, 585	Acts xiv. 20	391
Acts xiii. 12	232	Acts xiv. 21	223, 420, 539
Acts xiii. 13	109, 187, 372, 406*	Acts xiv. 22	430
Acts xiii. 15	183, 218	Acts xiv. 23	73
Acts xiii. 16	183, 610	Acts xiv. 26	472
Acts xiii. 17	377	Acts xiv. 27	876, 542
Acts xiii. 19	121		
Acts xiii. 20	218, 250	Acts xv. 1	215, 293
Acts xiii. 21	230	Acts xv. 2	373
Acts xiii. 22	113, 131, 180, 190, 228, 527	Acts xv. 3	431
Acts xiii. 23	192* 238	Acts xv. 4	127, 259, 430, 435, 539
Acts xiii. 24	607	Acts xv. 5	301, 370
Acts xiii. 25	169*, 319, 543	Acts xv. 6	128, 539
Acts xiii. 26	237*, 238*	Acts xv. 7	226*, 606
Acts xiii. 27	454*	Acts xv. 8	440
Acts xiii. 28	484	Acts xv. 10	152, 318* 488, 542
Acts xiii. 29	454	Acts xv. 12	177, 379, 515
Acts xiii. 30	123	Acts xv. 13	183, 329
Acts xiii. 31	405, 408, 543	Acts xv. 16	469*
Acts xiii. 32	223, 227, 454, 626	Acts xv. 17	141, 310
Acts xiii. 34	618*	Acts xv. 19	481
Acts xiii. 35	592*	Acts xv. 20	127, 326*, 427, 520
Acts xiii. 36	432, 540	Acts xv. 21	401*
Acts xiii. 37	158, 543	Acts xv. 22	255*, 567, 627
Acts xiii. 39	57, 422	Acts xv. 23	128, 133, 316, 588, 606
Acts xiii. 40	175, 430, 504	Acts xv. 24	322, 344, 545
Acts xiii. 41	293, 508	Acts xv. 25	320, 545, 627

Acts xv. 26	545	Acts xvii. 20	169
Acts xv. 27	342*	Acts xvii. 21	71, 244*, 549
Acts xv. 29	315, 345, 427, 520	Acts xvii. 22	244*, 523, 610
Acts xv. 31	232	Acts xvii. 24	120, 545
Acts xv. 36	142*, 298, 626, 627*	Acts xvii. 25	200, 637
Acts xv. 37	70	Acts xvii. 26	407, 539
Acts xv. 38	372*, 481, 482	Acts xvii. 27	76, 299*, 485
Acts xv. 39	435	Acts xvii. 28	104, 154, 389, 400*, 454*
		" " "	540, 640*
Acts xvi. 2	260, 420	Acts xvii. 29	441, 491*
Acts xvi. 3	607, 626	Acts xvii. 30	433
Acts xvi. 4	268, 296, 431	Acts xvii. 31	163, 389*, 410, 424, 463
Acts xvi. 5	215	Acts xvii. 32	82, 104, 123, 528
Acts xvi. 7	333, 400, 476*, 494		
Acts xvi. 9	112, 219*, 313, 380	Acts xviii. 1	112
Acts xvi. 10	262*	Acts xviii. 2	120, 182, 215, 329, 343, 543
Acts xvi. 11	590	Acts xviii. 3	72, 230, 395
		Acts xviii. 4	539, 552
Acts xvi. 13	403	Acts xviii. 5	129, 341, 518
Acts xvi. 14	433, 543	Acts xviii. 6	176*, 587
Acts xvi. 15	292, 314, 545	Acts xviii. 7	182
Acts xvi. 16	257*, 323, 543	Acts xviii. 8	113
Acts xvi. 18	553	Acts xviii. 9	610
Acts xvi. 19	202	Acts xviii. 10	593*
Acts xvi. 21	332, 493	Acts xviii. 11	249
Acts xvi. 22	269*, 332	Acts xviii. 12	206
Acts xvi. 23	539	Acts xviii. 13	404
Acts xvi. 24	69, 111, 542, 622	Acts xviii. 14	72, 183, 304, 401
Acts xvi. 25	401*, 518	Acts xviii. 15	154
Acts xvi. 26	63, 72, 176, 549	Acts xviii. 17	113, 202, 205
Acts xvi. 27	70, 334*, 544	Acts xviii. 18	253
Acts xvi. 28	222, 226, 501	Acts xviii. 19	150, 209
Acts xvi. 29	433	Acts xviii. 20	242
Acts xvi. 31	76, 518	Acts xviii. 21	415, 603
Acts xvi. 33	197, 372*	Acts xviii. 22	544
Acts xvi. 34	44, 346, 435, 539, 627	Acts xviii. 24	62, 120, 341
Acts xvi. 37	41, 73, 446*, 591	Acts xviii. 25	268
Acts xvi. 39	335	Acts xviii. 26	243, 539, 614*
Acts xvi. 40	396	Acts xviii. 27	259
		Acts xviii. 28	209
Acts xvii. 2	209, 211, 215, 217, 372*, 584*		
Acts xvii. 3	330, 580	Acts xix. 1	62, 219, 323, 543
Acts xvii. 4	262	Acts xix. 2	539, 298, 451, 493, 509
Acts xvii. 6	61, 73, 219, 484	Acts xix. 3	397*, 439, 539
Acts xvii. 9	420	Acts xix. 4	530, 550, 576
Acts xvii. 10	112, 129, 543	Acts xix. 6	71, 539
Acts xvii. 11	299*, 377	Acts xix. 10	408, 552
Acts xvii. 12	523	Acts xix. 11	140, 539, 606
Acts xvii. 13	82, 112	Acts xix. 12	428, 435
Acts xvii. 14	129, 617*	Acts xix. 13	226, 408
Acts xvii. 15	112, 420	Acts xix. 14	60, 170
Acts xvii. 16	112, 632	Acts xix. 16	132, 429, 431
Acts xvii. 18	71, 105, 171, 303*, 593*	Acts xix. 17	140

Acts xix. 19	527, 592	Acts xxi. 3	112, 260*, 270, 349*, 472
Acts xix. 22	251*, 415*	Acts xxi. 4	322*, 481, 543
Acts xix. 24	253, 257, 341	Acts xxi. 5	122, 323, 552
Acts xix. 25	367, 406, 543	Acts xxi. 6	430
Acts xix. 26	110, 321, 498*	Acts xxi. 8	134*, 592*
Acts xix. 27	44, 184*, 196, 228, 550	Acts xxi. 9	523
Acts xix. 28	584	Acts xxi. 11	155, 552
Acts xix. 29	201, 353*	Acts xxi. 12	325, 439
Acts xix. 31	594, 61, 171, 335, 481	Acts xxi. 13	332, 609*
Acts xix. 32	242	Acts xxi. 16	165, 203, 214*, 341, 513, 589*
Acts xix. 33	209, 330, 332	Acts xxi. 17	207, 465
Acts xix. 34	567*, 584	Acts xxi. 18	435
Acts xix. 35	234, 300, 447, 481, 523, 592	Acts xxi. 19	158
Acts xix. 37	222	Acts xxi. 21	219, 322*
Acts xix. 38	53, 590*	Acts xxi. 23	211
Acts xix. 39	292	Acts xxi. 24	75, 255
Acts xix. 40	203, 448	Acts xxi. 25	128, 223, 520
Acts xx. 1	543, 609*	Acts xxi. 26	218, 255, 275, 296
Acts xx. 2	145	Acts xxi. 28	114, 272, 344*, 439, 578*
Acts xx. 3	112, 211, 324, 428, 539, 567	Acts xxi. 29	321
Acts xx. 4	103, 138*, 519, 520, 593	Acts xxi. 30	86
Acts xx. 7	248, 435, 539	Acts xxi. 31	62, 215*
Acts xx. 9	341, 371, 375*, 431, 545	Acts xxi. 32	61
Acts xx. 10	430	Acts xxi. 33	168, 299*, 308
Acts xx. 11	541	Acts xxi. 34	484
Acts xx. 12	276	Acts xxi. 35	323
Acts xx. 13	262*	Acts xxi. 36	516, 526
Acts xx. 14	415*	Acts xxi. 37	509
Acts xx. 15	112, 590	Acts xxi. 38	106, 114, 134, 511*
Acts xx. 16	211, 294, 319, 477	Acts xxi. 39	313, 528, 545
Acts xx. 17	112	Acts xxii. 2	432
Acts xx. 18	298*, 422, 430, 549	Acts xxii. 3	187, 189*, 340*, 559*
Acts xx. 20	325, 545	Acts xxii. 4	543
Acts xx. 21	66, 539	Acts xxii. 5	141, 472
Acts xx. 22	215, 483	Acts xxii. 6	121, 220, 323, 406*, 432
Acts xx. 23	63, 340, 508	Acts xxii. 7	73
Acts xx. 24	186, 318	Acts xxii. 9	540, 550
Acts xx. 25	384	Acts xxii. 10	163
Acts xx. 26	197	Acts xxii. 11	268, 371*, 481
Acts xx. 27	325, 482, 604	Acts xxii. 12	528
Acts xx. 28	228, 527	Acts xxii. 13	54, 218, 313, 428
Acts xx. 29	205, 396, 484*	Acts xxii. 15	110, 158
Acts xx. 30	621	Acts xxii. 17	220*, 323*, 577
Acts xx. 31	552	Acts xxii. 18	137*
Acts xx. 32	391*	Acts xxii. 19	213*, 401
Acts xx. 33	204	Acts xxii. 21	396
Acts xx. 34	577	Acts xxii. 22	282*
Acts xx. 35	240	Acts xxii. 24	85, 301
Acts xx. 38	163	Acts xxii. 25	61, 208, 509
Acts xxi. 1	62, 323, 427, 590	Acts xxii. 26	61
Acts xxi. 2	342*, 344	Acts xxii. 28	439
		Acts xxii. 29	443

Acts xxii. 20	109, 261, 365*, 398*	Acts xxv. 2	539, 540
Acts xxiii. 1	111, 262	Acts xxv. 3	328, 341
Acts xxiii. 3	81, 332, 340	Acts xxv. 4	540
Acts xxiii. 5	222, 316, 502, 641*	Acts xxv. 5	77, 540, 558
Acts xxiii. 6	195, 203, 437, 631	Acts xxv. 6	239, 344, 540, 544, 596
Acts xxiii. 7	128	Acts xxv. 7	330, 373, 432, 525*, 540
Acts xxiii. 8	481, 493*, 540	Acts xxv. 9	375
Acts xxiii. 9	519, 599, 600*	Acts xxv. 10	227, 242*
Acts xxiii. 10	504, 545, 600	Acts xxv. 11	203, 253, 267*, 456, 540
Acts xxiii. 11	621	Acts xxv. 12	262*, 538
Acts xxiii. 12	297	Acts xxv. 13	138, 342, 518, 544
Acts xxiii. 13	239, 256, 596	Acts xxv. 14	401, 527
Acts xxiii. 14	44, 128, 150, 297, 466*, 543	Acts xxv. 15	128, 373, 543
Acts xxiii. 15	287, 313, 324, 329	Acts xxv. 16	122, 297, 309
Acts xxiii. 19	202	Acts xxv. 17	256, 475
Acts xxiii. 20	301	Acts xxv. 18	168, 373*
Acts xxiii. 21	193*, 297, 371, 596	Acts xxv. 20	299, 397, 543
Acts xxiii. 22	54, 545, 579	Acts xxv. 21	143, 332
Acts xxiii. 23	61, 170*, 313*, 579	Acts xxv. 22	82, 283*, 558, 587
Acts xxiii. 24	138, 579, 621	Acts xxv. 23	60, 402, 420, 560
Acts xxiii. 26	588	Acts xxv. 24	362, 493, 515, 516, 543
Acts xxiii. 27	134*, 544	Acts xxv. 26	288*
Acts xxiii. 29	203	Acts xxv. 27	69, 319
Acts xxiii. 30	278, 315, 375, 568*	Acts xxvi. 1	229, 268
Acts xxiii. 34	364, 366, 411, 582	Acts xxvi. 2	321
Acts xxiii. 35	308, 332, 558	Acts xxvi. 3	154, 231*, 400, 559, 572
Acts xxiv. 1	534	Acts xxvi. 4	124, 133, 136, 576
Acts xxiv. 2	614*	Acts xxvi. 5	401, 527, 626
Acts xxiv. 3	47, 200, 637	Acts xxvi. 6	394, 397
Acts xxiv. 4	561	Acts xxvi. 7	100, 331, 543, 549, 552, 593
Acts xxiv. 5	133, 208, 351, 567*	Acts xxvi. 8	395*, 542
Acts xxiv. 6	351*, 543, 567*	Acts xxvi. 9	136
Acts xxiv. 7	217	Acts xxvi. 10	107, 545
Acts xxiv. 8	76, 365, 543	Acts xxvi. 11	268, 545
Acts xxiv. 9	614	Acts xxvi. 12	133, 386, 545
Acts xxiv. 10	346, 367	Acts xxvi. 13	403, 545
Acts xxiv. 11	239, 318, 341, 592, 596	Acts xxvi. 14	396, 545
Acts xxiv. 12	441, 491	Acts xxvi. 15	85
Acts xxiv. 13	203, 491	Acts xxvi. 16	142, 158, 161, 166, 262*
Acts xxiv. 14	161, 219	Acts xxvi. 17	439, 442, 543, 545
Acts xxiv. 15	334	Acts xxvi. 18	141, 429, 545, 550
Acts xxiv. 17	550, 213, 342, 380*, 453	Acts xxvi. 19	139*, 385, 421, 545
Acts xxiv. 19	54, 282, 294*	Acts xxvi. 20	68, 549
Acts xxiv. 20	77, 85, 375	Acts xxvi. 21	352, 420, 435, 627
Acts xxiv. 21	123, 164, 203	Acts xxvi. 22	133, 140, 158, 455*, 485
Acts xxiv. 22	560*	Acts xxvi. 23	550, 559
Acts xxiv. 23	61	Acts xxvi. 24	97*, 123
Acts xxiv. 25	334, 342, 463	Acts xxvi. 25	108, 132, 514, 549, 550
Acts xxiv. 26	309	Acts xxvi. 26	40, 558
Acts xxv. 1	369*, 540, 544	Acts xxvi. 27	500*
		Acts xxvi. 28	549
		Acts xxvi. 29	209, 212, 235, 303*, 420*, 440

Acts xxvi. 30	126, 128, 519	Acts xxviii. 21	85, 489
Acts xxvi. 31	267*	Acts xxviii. 23	121, 372, 420, 422, 439,
Acts xxvi. 32	70, 305, 334, 477	" " "	543, 559
		Acts xxviii. 24	104
Acts xxvii. 1	62, 78, 182, 261, 326*, 540	Acts xxviii. 25	61, 602
Acts xxvii. 2	224*, 400, 430	Acts xxviii. 26	51, 83
Acts xxvii. 3	200, 321*, 539	Acts xxviii. 27	494, 503
Acts xxvii. 5	133, 187, 431*	Acts xxviii. 28	82
Acts xxvii. 6	525		
Acts xxvii. 7	484	Rom. i. 1	125, 545, 565
Acts xxvii. 8	471, 539	Rom. i. 2	543, 545, 565
Acts xxvii. 9	63, 334, 543	Rom. i. 3	186, 545, 565
Acts xxvii. 10	334, 339*, 573	Rom. i. 4	123, 188*, 237, 367*, 545, 565
Acts xxvii. 12	242, 299, 400, 405, 545	Rom. i. 5	120, 186, 379*, 383, 384, 402,
Acts xxvii. 13	243*, 334*, 594*	" " "	517, 543, 545, 565, 631
Acts xxvii. 14	147, 251*, 381*, 558	Rom. i. 6	195*, 517, 543, 545, 565
Acts xxvii. 17	209, 210, 504	Rom. i. 7	124, 189, 219, 234, 545, 565, 585
Acts xxvii. 18	256	Rom. i. 8	378, 383, 575, 576*
Acts xxvii. 20	120, 484, 488, 610	Rom. i. 9	386, 410
Acts xxvii. 21	87, 183, 282, 443, 481	Rom. i. 10	300, 376*
Acts xxvii. 22	223, 508, 633*	Rom. i. 11	198*
Acts xxvii. 23	218, 543	Rom. i. 12	155, 577
Acts xxvii. 25	183	Rom. i. 13	438, 440, 561, 562, 565
Acts xxvii. 27	123	Rom. i. 14	209, 439
Acts xxvii. 28	252*	Rom. i. 15	223, 230, 235
Acts xxvii. 29	71, 366, 504, 539	Rom. i. 16	221, 247*, 576*
Acts xxvii. 30	62	Rom. i. 17	59, 186*, 186*, 396, 419, 513
Acts xxvii. 31	61	Rom. i. 19	235*
Acts xxvii. 33	44, 70, 198, 335, 348	Rom. i. 20	123, 125, 128, 216, 235*, 439, 638
Acts xxvii. 34	364, 374*	Rom. i. 21	71, 582, 624*
Acts xxvii. 35	71, 614*	Rom. i. 22	321, 627
Acts xxvii. 36	198	Rom. i. 23	206, 388*, 524
Acts xxvii. 37	80, 250	Rom. i. 24	213, 263*, 326*, 387, 417*
Acts xxvii. 38	106, 201	Rom. i. 25	404*
Acts xxvii. 39	294, 557*	Rom. i. 26	237, 404, 571*
Acts xxvii. 40	64, 591, 594	Rom. i. 27	417, 571*
Acts xxvii. 42	336, 502*, 545	Rom. i. 28	480, 485, 638
Acts xxvii. 43	196, 251*, 528	Rom. i. 29	120, 217, 520, 553, 637
Acts xxvii. 44	105, 323, 528	Rom. i. 30	53*
		Rom. i. 31	553, 637
Acts xxviii. 2	420, 539	Rom. i. 32	123, 206, 344*
Acts xxviii. 3	257*, 368*, 371		
Acts xxviii. 4	366	Rom. ii. 1	135, 183, 387*, 533
Acts xxviii. 6	268, 396*, 416	Rom. ii. 2	401
Acts xxviii. 8	323	Rom. ii. 3	152, 161*, 183, 509
Acts xxviii. 9	456	Rom. ii. 4	190, 235, 353
Acts xxviii. 11	216	Rom. ii. 5	125, 188*, 402, 417*
Acts xxviii. 13	465, 528	Rom. ii. 7	187*, 519, 639
Acts xxviii. 14	392	Rom. ii. 8	424, 578
Acts xxviii. 16	62, 73	Rom. ii. 9	156*, 552, 576*, 578
Acts xxviii. 17	127, 129, 323, 485	Rom. ii. 10	578
Acts xxviii. 18	70, 482	Rom. ii. 11	395, 447
Acts xxviii. 20	229	Rom. ii. 12	123, 378, 386*, 447

Rom. ii. 13	186*, 447, 565*	Rom. iv. 9	129, 321, 409, 420, 587*, 595*
Rom. ii. 14	139*, 141, 211, 309, 447, 483	Rom. iv. 10	386, 420
" " "	556*, 565*, 620	Rom. iv. 11	133, 190, 380, 531
Rom. ii. 15	440, 565*, 580*, 615	Rom. iv. 12	209, 211, 219, 534, 555*, 577
Rom. ii. 17	76, 122, 233, 569*, 610	Rom. iv. 13	123, 186*, 320, 441, 447,
Rom. ii. 18	263, 569*, 594	" " "	453*, 586
Rom. ii. 19	321, 520, 569*	Rom. iv. 14	59, 109, 123, 273, 292, 368,
Rom. ii. 20	569*	" " "	447, 585, 593
Rom. ii. 21	322*, 481, 508, 569*	Rom. iv. 15	123, 447, 456
Rom. ii. 22	481	Rom. iv. 16	69, 368, 585, 598*
Rom. ii. 23	123, 233, 569	Rom. iv. 17	164, 165*
Rom. ii. 25	293	Rom. iv. 18	329, 404, 411, 465
Rom. ii. 26	145, 228, 259, 293	Rom. iv. 19	50, 486*
Rom. ii. 27	134*, 343*, 380*, 454*	Rom. iv. 20	215*, 216, 261, 342, 344, 397
Rom. ii. 28	421, 454*, 488, 584*	Rom. iv. 21	262
Rom. ii. 29	116	Rom. iv. 22	523*
		Rom. iv. 24	123, 628
Rom. iii. 1	174, 584	Rom. iv. 25	611, 639
Rom. iii. 2	229, 260*, 454*, 514, 575, 576		
Rom. iii. 3	585, 638	Rom. v. 1	186*, 378, 406
Rom. iii. 4	254, 310, 442	Rom. v. 2	583, 136*, 233, 271, 379
Rom. iii. 5	594, 122, 402, 511, 563	Rom. v. 3	233, 583*
Rom. iii. 6	279, 480, 500	Rom. v. 5	453, 107, 185, 378, 413, 414, 417
Rom. iii. 7	580	Rom. v. 6	124, 382, 383, 447, 453*, 553
Rom. iii. 8	287, 580, 628*	Rom. v. 7	117*, 279*, 447, 453*, 613
Rom. iii. 9	59, 60, 120, 258*, 264*, 407,	Rom. v. 8	137, 383, 553
" " "	548, 552, 554*, 585	Rom. v. 9	197, 594
Rom. iii. 10	178	Rom. v. 10	262
Rom. iii. 11	81, 109	Rom. v. 11	351*, 583*
Rom. iii. 13	77, 407*	Rom. v. 12	144, 158*, 394, 396, 562, 569*
Rom. iii. 18	185	" " "	599, 609
Rom. iii. 19	110, 460	Rom. v. 13	85, 123, 475, 570
Rom. iii. 20	171, 186, 280*	Rom. v. 14	82, 206, 394*, 409, 442, 542, 570
Rom. iii. 21	186*, 271	Rom. v. 15	110, 442, 541, 570*
Rom. iii. 22	186, 418*, 443	Rom. v. 16	60, 82, 340*, 368, 396, 584*
Rom. iii. 23	201, 274, 352, 353	Rom. v. 17	353
Rom. iii. 24	216, 217*, 352*	Rom. v. 18	188, 440, 445, 558, 570*, 587*
Rom. iii. 25	96*, 137, 152*, 228, 254, 378,	Rom. v. 19	110, 421, 587, 638
" " "	399, 412, 527	Rom. v. 20	123, 459
Rom. iii. 26	368, 412	Rom. v. 21	397, 418*, 440
Rom. iii. 27	116, 582		
Rom. iii. 28	120, 456, 595*	Rom. vi. 1	279, 285
Rom. iii. 29	192*	Rom. vi. 2	86, 168, 210, 279*, 386, 428
Rom. iii. 30	116, 186, 280*, 362*, 411*, 448	Rom. vi. 3	136, 509
Rom. iii. 31	78, 87, 123, 609	Rom. vi. 4	136, 137, 236, 288, 444
		Rom. vi. 5	292, 442*, 451
Rom. iv. 1	113, 334, 508	Rom. vi. 6	161, 188*, 326, 612*, 615
Rom. iv. 2	306*	Rom. vi. 8	49, 86, 391
Rom. iv. 3	453*, 523*	Rom. vi. 9	538
Rom. iv. 4	35, 108, 402*	Rom. vi. 10	168*, 210, 227, 422, 428
Rom. iv. 5	186, 483	Rom. vi. 11	210*, 228, 389*
Rom. iv. 7	81	Rom. vi. 12	488, 502, 524*
Rom. iv. 8	506, 585	Rom. vi. 13	314, 488

Rom. vi. 14	120, 279*, 316*	Rom. viii. 20	58, 399*, 485
Rom. vi. 15	82, 279, 420, 585	Rom. viii. 21	197, 531, 621
Rom. vi. 16	158, 266, 440, 612*	Rom. viii. 22	124, 610
Rom. vi. 17	164*, 261*, 368, 585, 629*	Rom. viii. 23	117*, 150, 187*, 528, 531*
Rom. vi. 18	197, 210	" " "	583, 637
Rom. vi. 19	128, 210, 397	Rom. viii. 24	216, 284*, 340, 437*
Rom. vi. 20	210*	Rom. viii. 25	292, 379, 423, 543
Rom. vi. 21	60, 141, 158*, 221	Rom. viii. 26	97, 109, 112, 168, 299*, 433
Rom. vi. 22	197, 417*	Rom. viii. 27	122, 400*, 584
Rom. vi. 23	176, 389	Rom. viii. 28	120, 534
Rom. vii. 1	123, 446, 562, 565, 589	Rom. viii. 29	158, 195, 228, 561
Rom. vii. 2	188*, 209, 271*, 293, 446, 621	Rom. viii. 30	277*, 278
Rom. vii. 3	280, 324, 343, 445, 558	Rom. viii. 31	382, 383, 584
Rom. vii. 4	118, 210*, 301, 381*	Rom. viii. 32	90, 154, 379, 560
Rom. vii. 5	133, 189, 258, 329	Rom. viii. 33	60, 180, 203, 234, 350, 382,
Rom. vii. 6	159, 236	" " "	431, 508, 513
Rom. vii. 7	189, 305*, 316, 448*, 477	Rom. viii. 34	382
Rom. vii. 8	575	Rom. viii. 35	185, 197, 440
Rom. vii. 9	87	Rom. viii. 36	188, 562
Rom. vii. 10	133, 160, 189, 616*, 621	Rom. viii. 38	488
Rom. vii. 11	189	Rom. viii. 39	133
Rom. vii. 12	520, 575*	Rom. ix. 1	248*, 390*, 537, 540, 562
Rom. vii. 13	41, 123, 189, 211, 346, 351,	Rom. ix. 2	639
" " "	513, 575	Rom. ix. 3	82, 71, 185, 283*, 370, 382, 621
Rom. vii. 14	98, 407*, 618	Rom. ix. 4	177*, 520
Rom. vii. 15	160	Rom. ix. 5	60, 230, 375, 401, 551*, 586*
Rom. vii. 17	152, 618*	Rom. ix. 6	160, 171, 271, 339*, 597*
Rom. vii. 18	320, 530	Rom. ix. 7	40, 575
Rom. vii. 19	160, 528	Rom. ix. 8	110, 160, 228, 514
Rom. vii. 20	618	Rom. ix. 10	583*
Rom. vii. 21	59, 149, 534, 557*, 571*	Rom. ix. 11	131, 193*, 425, 441, 459, 484,
Rom. vii. 22	401, 433	" " "	561, 562, 589*
Rom. vii. 24	37, 189*, 197, 237*, 286*, 634	Rom. ix. 12	245, 583
Rom. vii. 25	62, 221, 378, 601*	Rom. ix. 13	113, 549
Rom. viii. 1	135*, 390, 445	Rom. ix. 14	395, 500
Rom. viii. 2	126, 137*, 197	Rom. ix. 15	66, 88, 221
Rom. viii. 3	231*, 235*, 387*, 534, 574*, 624	Rom. ix. 16	85, 445, 598*
Rom. viii. 4	57, 58, 134, 420, 477, 482, 582	Rom. ix. 17	82, 143, 254
Rom. viii. 5	56, 402, 447, 453	Rom. ix. 18	85, 588
Rom. viii. 6	453*	Rom. ix. 19	274*, 280*, 588
Rom. viii. 7	397, 594	Rom. ix. 20	183, 465*, 511, 549, 559
Rom. viii. 8	452*	Rom. ix. 21	105, 112, 191, 366, 397, 550
Rom. viii. 9	57, 122, 195, 448, 477, 478	Rom. ix. 22	108, 235, 570*, 599
Rom. viii. 10	120	Rom. ix. 23	409, 570*
Rom. viii. 11	292, 363, 399	Rom. ix. 24	528, 627
Rom. viii. 12	209, 326*, 445, 556*	Rom. ix. 25	385, 476, 485
Rom. viii. 14	122	Rom. ix. 26	615
Rom. viii. 15	387, 397, 521, 609	Rom. ix. 27	383
Rom. viii. 16	122	Rom. ix. 29	304, 602, 605
Rom. viii. 17	441, 459, 460, 585	Rom. ix. 30	139, 186, 443
Rom. viii. 18	213*, 321, 334, 405*, 550	Rom. ix. 31	90, 636*
		Rom. ix. 32	582, 617*

Rom. ix. 33	233, 435	Rom. xi. 36	108, 379*, 418*
Rom. x. 1	133, 383, 412, 537, 575*, 586	Rom. xii. 1	58, 231, 332, 381*, 533*
Rom. x. 2	185*, 212, 403*, 447	Rom. xii. 2	519, 578
Rom. x. 3	186*, 447, 575*	Rom. xii. 3	400, 404, 433, 481, 550, 638
Rom. x. 4	123, 447	Rom. xii. 4	548
Rom. x. 5	133, 447	Rom. xii. 5	110, 249
Rom. x. 6	136, 186	Rom. xii. 6	352, 440, 545, 578*, 582
Rom. x. 7	318	Rom. xii. 7	545, 578*
Rom. x. 8	195	Rom. xii. 8	545
Rom. x. 10	120, 396, 611, 639	Rom. xii. 9	537, 585, 586*
Rom. x. 12	397	Rom. xii. 10	215
Rom. x. 14	199, 82, 158*, 166, 279*, 285*,	Rom. xii. 11	476
" " "	480, 632	Rom. xii. 12	210, 217*, 433
Rom. x. 15	118, 477, 606	Rom. xii. 14	537
Rom. x. 16	171	Rom. xii. 15	376
Rom. x. 17	123, 367, 411, 445, 558	Rom. xii. 16	219, 395*, 397, 537, 580
Rom. x. 18	111, 147*, 511*, 559	Rom. xii. 18	230, 585
Rom. x. 19	114*, 392, 393, 442, 464*,	Rom. xii. 19	594
" " "	476*, 511, 528	Rom. xii. 20	77, 293, 313*, 444, 580
Rom. x. 20	219, 469*	Rom. xii. 21	537
Rom. x. 21	405		
Rom. xi. 1	448, 511	Rom. xiii. 1	122, 156*, 363, 370, 371,
Rom. xi. 2	382, 385	" " "	537, 582*
Rom. xi. 4	179*	Rom. xiii. 2	212, 274, 301, 429
Rom. xi. 6	283*, 480, 582, 618*	Rom. xiii. 3	313, 368, 481, 524
Rom. xi. 7	200	Rom. xiii. 4	192, 293
Rom. xi. 8	94	Rom. xiii. 5	319, 585
Rom. xi. 10	63	Rom. xiii. 6	317, 631*
Rom. xi. 11	458, 459, 586	Rom. xiii. 7	590*
Rom. xi. 12	639	Rom. xiii. 8	47, 123, 209, 273, 323, 499, 501*
Rom. xi. 13	192*, 408*, 409, 551, 575*	Rom. xiii. 9	87, 109, 151, 316, 502, 565
Rom. xi. 15	521	Rom. xiii. 11	195, 239, 319, 366*, 551,
Rom. xi. 16	582*, 584, 585	" " "	565*, 573*, 585
Rom. xi. 17	200, 292, 391*, 637, 638	Rom. xiii. 13	219, 477
Rom. xi. 18	76, 292, 431*, 470, 501, 619*	Rom. xiii. 14	396, 397, 417, 549, 556*
Rom. xi. 19	118, 280*		
Rom. xi. 20	216*, 313*	Rom. xiv. 1	174, 397, 476
Rom. xi. 21	193*, 401, 425, 448, 474*,	Rom. xiv. 2	105, 322*
" " "	478, 504*, 598*	Rom. xiv. 3	482
Rom. xi. 22	363, 578	Rom. xiv. 4	152, 154, 210
Rom. xi. 23	620*	Rom. xiv. 5	154, 404*
Rom. xi. 24	154, 429, 430	Rom. xiv. 6	212
Rom. xi. 25	42, 211, 287, 423*, 477	Rom. xiv. 7	441
Rom. xi. 26	428	Rom. xiv. 8	295*
Rom. xi. 27	131, 193*, 308	Rom. xiv. 9	161, 206, 276, 457, 552*
Rom. xi. 28	401	Rom. xiv. 10	440
Rom. xi. 30	216, 440	Rom. xiv. 11	209, 449, 457*
Rom. xi. 31	60, 153*, 459*, 550	Rom. xiv. 13	323, 502, 529, 619
Rom. xi. 32	178, 397*, 459, 610, 622	Rom. xiv. 14	152, 160, 390*, 609
Rom. xi. 33	191*, 519, 639	Rom. xiv. 15	383, 402, 619
Rom. xi. 35	436	Rom. xiv. 16	155, 502
		Rom. xiv. 17	139, 390*, 552

Rom. xiv. 19	133	Rom. xvi. 1o	103
Rom. xiv. 20	380, 443	Rom. xvi. 16	118
Rom. xiv. 21	65, 158, 198, 320, 475*, 488	Rom. xvi. 17	126, 251, 314, 332, 404, 429
" " "	583*, 584	Rom. xvi. 18	447
Rom. xiv. 22	159, 386, 483, 508, 585	Rom. xvi. 19	283, 397
Rom. xiv. 23	262, 273*, 293, 582	Rom. xvi. 20	280*, 621
Rom. xv. 1	476	Rom. xvi. 22	390, 521
Rom. xv. 2	397	Rom. xvi. 25	218, 401, 545, 567*
Rom. xv. 3	74, 118, 222, 448, 574*, 599	Rom. xvi. 26	186, 396, 435, 567*
Rom. xv. 4	153*, 189*	Rom. xvi. 27	108, 168, 378, 545, 567*
Rom. xv. 5	78, 185, 286, 321, 401	1 Cor. i. 2	263*, 234, 530
Rom. xv. 6	388	1 Cor. i. 3	122, 124
Rom. xv. 7	118, 122	1 Cor. i. 4	393, 412
Rom. xv. 8	122, 153, 185, 334, 383	1 Cor. i. 5	201, 566
Rom. xv. 9	322*, 332*, 383	1 Cor. i. 6	118, 185*, 566
Rom. xv. 11	314	1 Cor. i. 7	134, 201, 480, 499
Rom. xv. 12	206, 233	1 Cor. i. 8	144, 157*, 417*, 438, 528,
Rom. xv. 13	185, 201, 410	" " "	566*, 624
Rom. xv. 14	201, 373	1 Cor. i. 9	378, 585
Rom. xv. 15	243*, 278, 379, 399*, 455, 617*	1 Cor. i. 10	62, 336, 381*, 611
Rom. xv. 16	223*, 455, 531	1 Cor. i. 11	65, 190*
Rom. xv. 17	230, 390, 453*	1 Cor. i. 12	60, 153, 161, 195, 625*
Rom. xv. 18	158, 166, 216, 217, 279,	1 Cor. i. 13	60, 118, 508
" " "	498, 552	1 Cor. i. 15	301
Rom. xv. 19	65, 118, 334	1 Cor. i. 16	60, 298, 443
Rom. xv. 20	556*, 615	1 Cor. i. 17	118, 318, 496
Rom. xv. 21	82, 575, 599	1 Cor. i. 18	131, 185, 211, 217
Rom. xv. 22	268, 325, 604	1 Cor. i. 19	83
Rom. xv. 23	324, 326, 483	1 Cor. i. 20	75, 609
Rom. xv. 24	198, 201, 308*, 321, 331, 472*	1 Cor. i. 21	144, 381*
Rom. xv. 25	265, 342*	1 Cor. i. 22	612*
Rom. xv. 26	133, 256	1 Cor. i. 23	135, 441, 541, 612, 638
Rom. xv. 27	200, 209, 292, 448	1 Cor. i. 25	235, 239, 245*
Rom. xv. 28	343, 378*, 385, 621	1 Cor. i. 26	317, 585
Rom. xv. 29	384	1 Cor. i. 27	108, 178, 189*, 609
Rom. xv. 30	332, 381	1 Cor. i. 28	129, 178, 484*
Rom. xv. 31	133, 234	1 Cor. i. 29	171, 477
Rom. xv. 32	122	1 Cor. i. 30	122, 371*, 439, 542, 550
Rom. xv. 33	585	1 Cor. i. 31	599*
Rom. xvi. 1	133; 134, 343	1 Cor. ii. 1	185, 342, 402, 607
Rom. xvi. 2	159, 234, 307, 390, 448, 638	1 Cor. ii. 3	152, 420
Rom. xvi. 3	136	1 Cor. ii. 4	96, 126, 611
Rom. xvi. 4	562, 566*	1 Cor. ii. 5	420, 586
Rom. xvi. 5	185, 397	1 Cor. ii. 6	218*, 385, 443
Rom. xvi. 7	143, 372	1 Cor. ii. 7	137, 167, 193, 387
Rom. xvi. 8	103, 113, 136	1 Cor. ii. 8	304, 562
Rom. xvi. 10	136, 190*	1 Cor. ii. 9	168, 317, 575, 599, 620, 633*
Rom. xvi. 11	66, 190*, 390	1 Cor. ii. 10	599*
Rom. xvi. 12	390*	1 Cor. ii. 11	133, 271, 550, 551
Rom. xvi. 13	155	1 Cor. ii. 12	193*, 259
Rom. xvi. 14	103	1 Cor. ii. 13	194*, 637

1 Cor. ii. 14	116	1 Cor. v. 7	44, 284, 448, 524, 528, 534, 538
1 Cor. ii. 15	116, 559	1 Cor. v. 8	120, 301, 384, 477, 531
1 Cor. ii. 16	125, 300	1 Cor. v. 9	106, 278, 481, 555*
		1 Cor. v. 10	128, 129, 283, 445
1 Cor. iii. 1	46, 70, 98, 217, 583, 594	1 Cor. v. 11	278*, 481, 572*
1 Cor. iii. 2	70, 226, 493*, 520, 594, 622*	1 Cor. v. 12	211, 586
1 Cor. iii. 3	99, 447	1 Cor. v. 13	313, 438, 538
1 Cor. iii. 4	62, 308, 447		
1 Cor. iii. 5	378, 437, 442, 447, 455*, 550	1 Cor. vi. 1	254*, 375, 613
1 Cor. iii. 6	247	1 Cor. vi. 2	234, 292, 385, 638
1 Cor. iii. 7	583	1 Cor. vi. 3	124*
1 Cor. iii. 8	128	1 Cor. vi. 4	60, 160, 317, 550, 561
1 Cor. iii. 9	192	1 Cor. vi. 5	80, 173, 175*, 300, 398
1 Cor. iii. 10	298, 300*	1 Cor. vi. 6	214, 442, 451
1 Cor. iii. 11	404*	1 Cor. vi. 7	214, 254*
1 Cor. iii. 12	430, 520	1 Cor. vi. 10	488, 500*
1 Cor. iii. 13	265, 388, 457*	1 Cor. vi. 11	41, 142, 162*, 255, 442, 513,
1 Cor. iii. 14	53	" " "	529, 609, 625
1 Cor. iii. 15	87, 150, 378, 443	1 Cor. vi. 12	369
1 Cor. iii. 16	122	1 Cor. vi. 13	211, 586
1 Cor. iii. 17	166, 539, 638	1 Cor. vi. 14	378
1 Cor. iii. 18	253, 287, 410, 613	1 Cor. vi. 15	47, 118, 192, 608
1 Cor. iii. 19	352*, 395	1 Cor. vi. 16	183, 522*
1 Cor. iii. 20	626	1 Cor. vi. 18	223, 233, 310, 538
1 Cor. iii. 21	195, 233, 301, 575	1 Cor. vi. 19	122, 163, 174, 195*
		1 Cor. vi. 20	206, 313, 386, 595*
1 Cor. iv. 1	161, 527		
1 Cor. iv. 2	168, 337, 386, 580, 616	1 Cor. vii. 1	57, 159, 166, 320
1 Cor. iv. 3	184*, 211, 337, 420, 460, 635	1 Cor. vii. 2	154*, 176, 398*
1 Cor. iv. 4	271, 350, 387*, 447*, 630	1 Cor. vii. 3	106, 571, 582
1 Cor. iv. 5	108, 124, 371	1 Cor. vii. 4	495, 538
1 Cor. iv. 6	62, 173, 289*, 323, 382*, 386*	1 Cor. vii. 5	303*, 424*
" " "	516, 580, 590*	1 Cor. vii. 7	283*, 368, 440, 452*, 465*
1 Cor. iv. 7	76, 443, 452*, 484	" " "	528, 603
1 Cor. iv. 8	302*, 538, 609	1 Cor. vii. 8	320
1 Cor. iv. 9	127*, 228, 446, 453, 517, 528	1 Cor. vii. 9	77, 84, 292, 477
1 Cor. iv. 10	411	1 Cor. vii. 10	197, 321, 496*
1 Cor. iv. 11	92	1 Cor. vii. 11	262, 293, 565
1 Cor. iv. 13	530	1 Cor. vii. 12	152, 496*, 502, 520
1 Cor. iv. 14	125, 278, 342, 485, 573, 578*	1 Cor. vii. 13	150, 502, 577
1 Cor. iv. 15	442*	1 Cor. vii. 14	132, 271, 283*, 389*, 445
1 Cor. iv. 16	545	1 Cor. vii. 15	311*, 386, 417, 518, 538
1 Cor. iv. 17	133, 166, 167*, 226	1 Cor. vii. 16	85, 299
1 Cor. iv. 18	278, 484, 617	1 Cor. vii. 18	169*
1 Cor. iv. 20	586	1 Cor. vii. 19	583*
1 Cor. iv. 21	285, 384, 420	1 Cor. vii. 20	422
		1 Cor. vii. 21	541, 582*, 595
1 Cor. v. 1	384, 480, 550*, 615	1 Cor. vii. 22	124
1 Cor. v. 2	315, 429, 436*, 508	1 Cor. vii. 23	538, 539
1 Cor. v. 3	160, 453*, 575	1 Cor. vii. 24	314, 395*
1 Cor. v. 4	391, 562	1 Cor. vii. 25	124, 455
1 Cor. v. 5	160, 459*	1 Cor. vii. 26	106, 320*, 455*, 523, 568, 602
1 Cor. v. 6	524	1 Cor. vii. 27	197, 209

1 Cor. vii. 28	84, 205, 211, 277, 284*, 293*	1 Cor. ix. 25	111, 227, 582
1 Cor. vii. 29	596, 106, 287, 459*, 460, 484	1 Cor. ix. 26	474, 484, 485*
1 Cor. vii. 31	210, 251, 340	1 Cor. ix. 27	43, 502
1 Cor. vii. 32	299		
1 Cor. vii. 33	109, 299	1 Cor. x. 1	106, 407, 476*, 549, 609
1 Cor. vii. 34	215, 299, 519	1 Cor. x. 2	67, 255*
1 Cor. vii. 35	211, 329, 354, 430, 464	1 Cor. x. 3	133, 198
1 Cor. vii. 36	77, 242, 296, 321, 332, 631*	1 Cor. x. 4	114, 118, 199, 268*, 281, 525
1 Cor. vii. 37	161, 193*, 483, 573*	1 Cor. x. 5	71, 232
1 Cor. vii. 38	242, 243, 439*, 576*	1 Cor. x. 6	175, 329*, 527
1 Cor. vii. 39	84, 158, 159, 319, 390, 584	1 Cor. x. 7	318
1 Cor. vii. 40	613	1 Cor. x. 8	74, 250, 502
		1 Cor. x. 9	143*, 369
1 Cor. viii. 1	84, 562, 565*	1 Cor. x. 10	106
1 Cor. viii. 2	499, 539, 565*, 613	1 Cor. x. 11	175, 405, 452*, 515, 527, 550
1 Cor. viii. 3	263*, 565*	1 Cor. x. 12	78, 301, 504, 613*
1 Cor. viii. 4	123, 444, 558, 565	1 Cor. x. 13	324, 325, 585, 590*, 594*
1 Cor. viii. 5	116, 120	1 Cor. x. 14	223*, 313
1 Cor. viii. 6	149, 419*, 579	1 Cor. x. 16	118, 164, 189*, 237, 628
1 Cor. viii. 7	185*, 191, 198, 216, 450,	1 Cor. x. 17	110, 201, 368
" " "	466, 550	1 Cor. x. 18	114, 135*, 200
1 Cor. viii. 8	279	1 Cor. x. 19	53
1 Cor. viii. 9	211, 452*, 504	1 Cor. x. 20	442, 520
1 Cor. viii. 10	134, 263*, 293	1 Cor. x. 21	124, 125, 189*, 200
1 Cor. viii. 11	394, 446	1 Cor. x. 22	284*
1 Cor. viii. 12	155	1 Cor. x. 23	495
1 Cor. viii. 13	65, 506	1 Cor. x. 24	496, 583
		1 Cor. x. 25	313
1 Cor. ix. 1	510	1 Cor. x. 27	550, 593*, 614*
1 Cor. ix. 2	211, 212, 444, 479*	1 Cor. x. 28	421
1 Cor. ix. 3	211	1 Cor. x. 29	150
1 Cor. ix. 4	319, 511	1 Cor. x. 30	159, 216
1 Cor. ix. 5	228, 257*, 319, 511, 523*, 527	1 Cor. x. 32	439
1 Cor. ix. 6	324, 326, 465, 518	1 Cor. x. 33	483*
1 Cor. ix. 7	198, 199, 216*		
1 Cor. ix. 8	402	1 Cor. xi. 1	582*
1 Cor. ix. 9	205, 316, 446, 495, 595*	1 Cor. xi. 2	205, 227, 453*
1 Cor. ix. 10	45, 394, 446	1 Cor. xi. 3	114, 118, 122
1 Cor. ix. 11	155, 294	1 Cor. xi. 4	111, 344*, 381*, 411, 544, 594
1 Cor. ix. 12	185, 200, 209, 582	1 Cor. xi. 5	108, 150, 178, 216*
1 Cor. ix. 13	84, 108, 433	1 Cor. xi. 6	311*, 320, 437*, 478*
1 Cor. ix. 14	367	1 Cor. xi. 7	122, 513
1 Cor. ix. 15	162, 209, 218, 239, 276, 278,	1 Cor. xi. 8	447
" " "	337*, 386*, 530, 572	1 Cor. xi. 9	409
1 Cor. ix. 16	293, 430, 447	1 Cor. xi. 10	374, 411
1 Cor. ix. 17	229, 260, 292, 465, 528,	1 Cor. xi. 12	381*, 409
" " "	541, 620	1 Cor. xi. 13	319, 433
1 Cor. ix. 18	108, 137, 329	1 Cor. xi. 15	271*, 364*
1 Cor. ix. 19	87, 242, 257, 341*, 344	1 Cor. xi. 16	582, 613*, 619
1 Cor. ix. 20	87, 123, 278*	1 Cor. xi. 17	396, 420
1 Cor. ix. 21	87, 483, 484, 562	1 Cor. xi. 18	274*, 347, 413, 414*, 575, 576*
1 Cor. ix. 22	170	1 Cor. xi. 20	319, 320*, 444, 576
1 Cor. ix. 24	313, 598	1 Cor. xi. 21	77, 105

1 Cor. xi. 22	86, 174, 285, 447, 511,	1 Cor. xiv. 7	54, 129, 134, 279, 344*,
" " "	552, 594*	" " "	444, 553*
1 Cor. xi. 23	116, 139, 144, 153, 270, 370*	1 Cor. xiv. 8	253
" " "	432, 438, 582	1 Cor. xiv. 9	349, 378, 446, 561
1 Cor. xi. 24	153	1 Cor. xiv. 10	123, 639
1 Cor. xi. 25	308*, 386, 403*, 582	1 Cor. xiv. 11	217, 218*, 385, 387*, 444, 577
1 Cor. xi. 26	42, 297, 308*, 317*, 454*	1 Cor. xiv. 13	460*
1 Cor. xi. 27	202, 301, 441*	1 Cor. xiv. 15	62, 279*, 285
1 Cor. xi. 28	199, 452*	1 Cor. xiv. 16	108, 279, 480
1 Cor. xi. 29	343, 552, 638	1 Cor. xiv. 18	345*, 627
1 Cor. xi. 30	267*, 274, 527	1 Cor. xiv. 19	62, 122, 241, 389
1 Cor. xi. 31	150, 253, 304, 638	1 Cor. xiv. 20	215*
1 Cor. xi. 32	391	1 Cor. xiv. 22	184, 211, 212, 301, 496
1 Cor. xi. 34	308*	1 Cor. xiv. 23	496, 510
1 Cor. xii. 1	373	1 Cor. xiv. 24	518, 609
1 Cor. xii. 2	132, 306, 457, 526, 571, 636	1 Cor. xiv. 25	122, 515
1 Cor. xii. 3	122, 390*	1 Cor. xiv. 26	520, 538, 625
1 Cor. xii. 4	437, 540	1 Cor. xiv. 27	401*, 582*
1 Cor. xii. 5	437	1 Cor. xiv. 30	244
1 Cor. xii. 6	258, 437	1 Cor. xiv. 31	249
1 Cor. xii. 7	405	1 Cor. xiv. 33	196
1 Cor. xii. 8	105, 378, 401, 411, 419*	1 Cor. xiv. 34	229, 622
1 Cor. xii. 9	419*	1 Cor. xiv. 35	122, 320, 333
1 Cor. xii. 12	548, 606	1 Cor. xiv. 36	396
1 Cor. xii. 13	229, 440, 552, 621	1 Cor. xiv. 37	168, 278, 613, 626
1 Cor. xii. 15	368*, 404*, 498*	1 Cor. xiv. 38	311*
1 Cor. xii. 16	404*	1 Cor. xiv. 39	323
1 Cor. xii. 19	304	1 Cor. xv. 1	71, 438
1 Cor. xii. 22	240, 245, 528, 549, 550	1 Cor. xv. 2	265, 561, 605
1 Cor. xii. 23	240	1 Cor. xv. 3	412
1 Cor. xii. 27	125, 424*	1 Cor. xv. 4	272*, 281
1 Cor. xii. 28	105, 568*	1 Cor. xv. 6	250
1 Cor. xii. 31	132, 242, 265, 464, 466*	1 Cor. xv. 8	46, 53, 106, 171
1 Cor. xiii. 1	273, 292, 440, 441, 549	1 Cor. xv. 9	337, 565, 615*
1 Cor. xiii. 2	44, 527, 610	1 Cor. xv. 11	518
1 Cor. xiii. 3	75, 226*, 289	1 Cor. xv. 12	123, 626
1 Cor. xiii. 4	520, 538	1 Cor. xv. 13	123, 452*, 478*
1 Cor. xiii. 5	520, 538	1 Cor. xv. 14	452*
1 Cor. xiii. 6	210, 232, 433, 520, 538	1 Cor. xv. 15	123, 185, 382, 445
1 Cor. xiii. 7	520, 538	1 Cor. xv. 16	292*, 478
1 Cor. xiii. 8	520, 538, 585	1 Cor. xv. 18	135, 390*
1 Cor. xiii. 10	109	1 Cor. xv. 19	233, 243
1 Cor. xiii. 11	80, 268, 270, 296, 609	1 Cor. xv. 20	123, 527, 530
1 Cor. xiii. 12	153*, 263*, 377, 380*, 404*	1 Cor. xv. 21	123, 586*, 610
1 Cor. xiii. 13	240*, 242*	1 Cor. xv. 22	389, 421, 440
1 Cor. xiv. 1	453*, 577*	1 Cor. xv. 23	527
1 Cor. xiv. 2	549	1 Cor. xv. 24	124, 308
1 Cor. xiv. 4	122, 150	1 Cor. xv. 25	297, 332, 523*, 588*, 589
1 Cor. xiv. 5	294*, 129, 239, 577, 605*	1 Cor. xv. 26	527
1 Cor. xiv. 6	387, 420, 440, 612	1 Cor. xv. 27	272, 308, 522, 582, 585, 588
		1 Cor. xv. 28	112, 114
		1 Cor. xv. 29	123, 175, 279*, 382*, 480

1 Cor. xv. 31	153*, 517	2 Cor. i. 11	222*, 412
1 Cor. xv. 32	108, 123, 285, 585	2 Cor. i. 12	70, 98, 122, 243, 247*, 420
1 Cor. xv. 33	41, 640*	2 Cor. i. 13	442*
1 Cor. xv. 34	312*, 314	2 Cor. i. 14	423*, 513
1 Cor. xv. 35	266*, 280*, 442, 443	2 Cor. i. 15	216, 283*
1 Cor. xv. 36	158, 183	2 Cor. i. 16	431
1 Cor. xv. 37	294*, 340, 621	2 Cor. i. 17	109, 395, 445, 460*, 476, 513
1 Cor. xv. 38	457	2 Cor. i. 18	449, 476, 585
1 Cor. xv. 39	171	2 Cor. i. 19	272, 476, 558
1 Cor. xv. 40	586	2 Cor. i. 21	521, 584
1 Cor. xv. 41	120, 196, 217, 562	2 Cor. i. 22	417
1 Cor. xv. 42	123, 266, 522	2 Cor. i. 23	340, 619
1 Cor. xv. 43	533	2 Cor. i. 24	206, 210, 555, 597
1 Cor. xv. 44	549	2 Cor. ii. 1	161, 212, 323, 386, 482, 529
1 Cor. xv. 46	234, 592*	2 Cor. ii. 2	108, 367, 368, 437
1 Cor. xv. 47	59	2 Cor. ii. 3	159, 208, 278, 282, 409, 410
1 Cor. xv. 49	78, 277*	2 Cor. ii. 4	243, 278, 366, 379*, 550
1 Cor. xv. 50	161, 518, 596	2 Cor. ii. 5	292, 497
1 Cor. xv. 51	555*	2 Cor. ii. 6	133, 209, 517*
1 Cor. xv. 52	89, 123, 385*, 436, 522*, 555*	2 Cor. ii. 7	46, 323, 502
1 Cor. xv. 53	331	2 Cor. ii. 8	120, 332
1 Cor. xv. 54	541, 606, 621, 639	2 Cor. ii. 9	161, 278
1 Cor. xv. 56	114	2 Cor. ii. 10	261, 264*, 448
1 Cor. xv. 57	340, 341	2 Cor. ii. 12	145, 211*, 397*, 443, 458*
1 Cor. xv. 58	344	2 Cor. ii. 13	145, 328*, 475
1 Cor. xvi. 1	133, 313, 373*, 397	2 Cor. ii. 14	23, 251, 389
1 Cor. xvi. 2	248, 307, 395, 401, 541	2 Cor. ii. 16	397, 584, 610*
1 Cor. xvi. 3	60, 176*, 308, 310, 318,	2 Cor. ii. 17	110
" " "	380*, 543	2 Cor. iii. 1	87, 200, 508, 614
1 Cor. xvi. 4	324*	2 Cor. iii. 2	114, 134, 430, 431, 513, 638
1 Cor. xvi. 5	446, 562*	2 Cor. iii. 3	98*, 384, 420
1 Cor. xvi. 6	159, 365*, 405, 440	2 Cor. iii. 4	555*
1 Cor. xvi. 7	283, 331	2 Cor. iii. 5	319, 367, 411, 597
1 Cor. xvi. 9	437*, 585	2 Cor. iii. 6	83, 191*, 228, 438, 527
1 Cor. xvi. 10	124	2 Cor. iii. 7	341, 480, 634, 635*
1 Cor. xvi. 12	62, 336, 373, 554	2 Cor. iii. 8	280*
1 Cor. xvi. 13	313	2 Cor. iii. 9	236, 455*
1 Cor. xvi. 15	60, 125, 185, 515, 626	2 Cor. iii. 10	43, 271
1 Cor. xvi. 17	153*	2 Cor. iii. 11	379, 411*, 424, 425
1 Cor. xvi. 21	529*, 531	2 Cor. iii. 12	111
1 Cor. xvi. 22	79, 479*	2 Cor. iii. 13	329, 582*
2 Cor. i. 2	122, 139	2 Cor. iii. 14	46, 534*, 565
2 Cor. i. 3	551, 586	2 Cor. iii. 15	296, 408, 565, 590
2 Cor. i. 4	163	2 Cor. iii. 16	40, 308*, 565
2 Cor. i. 5	189*, 378	2 Cor. iii. 17	114, 565
2 Cor. i. 6	136, 155, 383, 527, 582*	2 Cor. iii. 18	124, 174, 229, 254*, 370,
2 Cor. i. 7	440, 572	" " "	419, 565
2 Cor. i. 8	83, 324, 383, 403	2 Cor. iv. 1	565*
2 Cor. i. 9	233, 123, 150, 214, 410, 459	2 Cor. iv. 2	41, 85, 87, 253*, 386, 405, 488
2 Cor. i. 10	233, 273	2 Cor. iv. 3	218*

2 Cor. iv. 4	118, 190, 329, 482, 624*	2 Cor. vii. 1	186, 197, 344, 544
2 Cor. iv. 5	399	2 Cor. vii. 2	538, 609
2 Cor. iv. 6	168, 367*	2 Cor. vii. 3	49, 329
2 Cor. iv. 7	195*, 236, 412, 460*	2 Cor. vii. 4	217, 383
2 Cor. iv. 8	355, 485, 520, 638	2 Cor. vii. 5	352*, 568, 572
2 Cor. iv. 9	355, 485	2 Cor. vii. 6	528, 534
2 Cor. iv. 10	189, 355	2 Cor. vii. 7	135, 216*, 234, 243*, 584
2 Cor. iv. 11	123, 213, 446, 522	2 Cor. vii. 8	584, 612
2 Cor. iv. 12	301	2 Cor. vii. 9	397, 402*, 460*, 477, 496*
2 Cor. iv. 13	112, 351*, 401	2 Cor. vii. 10	402*
2 Cor. iv. 15	586	2 Cor. vii. 11	161, 320
2 Cor. iv. 16	155, 442, 463*	2 Cor. vii. 12	43, 133, 278, 329, 354, 405, 582, 601
2 Cor. iv. 17	235, 396, 411, 635*	" " "	
2 Cor. iv. 18	208*, 484*	2 Cor. vii. 13	240, 243, 371, 393*
		2 Cor. vii. 14	227, 233, 292, 375*
2 Cor. v. 1	122, 155, 191, 266*, 293, 524, 528, 531	2 Cor. vii. 15	205, 377
" " "		2 Cor. vii. 16	410
2 Cor. v. 2	147*, 353*		
2 Cor. v. 3	560, 616	2 Cor. viii. 1	218
2 Cor. v. 4	83, 107*, 353, 394, 448, 459, 638	2 Cor. viii. 2	381*, 386, 425
" " "		2 Cor. viii. 3	562, 571*
2 Cor. v. 5	531*	2 Cor. viii. 4	133, 155, 198, 631
2 Cor. v. 6	352*, 430, 562, 573*	2 Cor. viii. 5	122, 572, 576*, 584*
2 Cor. v. 7	41, 120, 379, 565	2 Cor. viii. 6	288, 329*
2 Cor. v. 8	443, 562	2 Cor. viii. 7	193*, 315, 450, 451*
2 Cor. v. 10	159, 405	2 Cor. viii. 8	381*
2 Cor. v. 11	186, 331*, 334	2 Cor. viii. 9	157, 341
2 Cor. v. 12	41, 87, 352*, 594	2 Cor. viii. 10	323, 422, 480, 560*
2 Cor. v. 13	212, 582	2 Cor. viii. 11	313, 324, 368, 560*, 585
2 Cor. v. 14	185	2 Cor. viii. 12	307*
2 Cor. v. 15	161, 383, 445, 477, 558	2 Cor. viii. 13	424*, 585, 586
2 Cor. v. 16	292, 301	2 Cor. viii. 15	589*
2 Cor. v. 17	235, 390	2 Cor. viii. 16	414, 585
2 Cor. v. 18	209	2 Cor. viii. 17	242*, 443
2 Cor. v. 19	145, 349, 618*	2 Cor. viii. 18	278, 378, 433
2 Cor. v. 20	262, 383*	2 Cor. viii. 19	391, 533
2 Cor. v. 21	186, 382, 484*, 638	2 Cor. viii. 20	53, 351*
		2 Cor. viii. 22	240, 637
2 Cor. vi. 1	332	2 Cor. viii. 23	383, 578, 585
2 Cor. vi. 2	522, 565, 609	2 Cor. viii. 24	174, 397, 602
2 Cor. vi. 3	483, 484*, 499		
2 Cor. vi. 4	78, 87, 181*, 389	2 Cor. ix. 1	133, 447*, 576
2 Cor. vi. 6	389	2 Cor. ix. 2	65, 193*, 208, 222, 233, 272, 383, 422, 629
2 Cor. vi. 7	132, 378, 389, 552	" " "	
2 Cor. vi. 8	389	2 Cor. ix. 3	576
2 Cor. vi. 9	573	2 Cor. ix. 5	318, 336
2 Cor. vi. 11	271	2 Cor. ix. 6	176, 392*, 394, 596*
2 Cor. vi. 12	388	2 Cor. ix. 7	446, 587*
2 Cor. vi. 13	530*, 620*	2 Cor. ix. 8	637
2 Cor. vi. 14	211, 221*, 350, 406, 584	2 Cor. ix. 9	469*, 588
2 Cor. vi. 15	41, 234, 443	2 Cor. ix. 10	286, 572
2 Cor. vi. 16	430	2 Cor. ix. 11	211, 572
2 Cor. vi. 17	74, 147*, 201	2 Cor. ix. 12	211, 572

2 Cor. ix. 13	118, 136, 186, 381*, 572*	2 Cor. xii. 1	124, 177, 454*
2 Cor. ix. 14	204, 217	2 Cor. xii. 2	83, 121, 126, 160, 176, 372,
2 Cor. ix. 15	393, 585	" " "	417, 565
2 Cor. x. 1	381, 397, 521, 558	2 Cor. xii. 3	111, 626
2 Cor. x. 2	259, 321, 322*, 409, 443, 482	2 Cor. xii. 4	83, 331, 626
" " "	527, 602	2 Cor. xii. 5	383, 454
2 Cor. x. 3	411, 638	2 Cor. xii. 6	199, 159, 453*, 502
2 Cor. x. 4	212, 248, 565	2 Cor. xii. 7	177, 220*, 550, 561, 611
2 Cor. x. 5	186, 621	2 Cor. xii. 8	336, 383, 427
2 Cor. x. 6	332	2 Cor. xii. 9	118, 209, 240, 271, 284
2 Cor. x. 7	122, 161, 195, 372*, 585	2 Cor. xii. 10	232
2 Cor. x. 9	310*	2 Cor. xii. 11	197, 282*, 422, 477, 538
2 Cor. x. 10	522*, 563	2 Cor. xii. 12	106, 111*, 410, 575
2 Cor. x. 11	161	2 Cor. xii. 13	403*
2 Cor. x. 12	81, 87, 150, 209, 218*, 331, 637	2 Cor. xii. 14	41, 332, 625
2 Cor. x. 13	163, 165, 318, 396, 530	2 Cor. xii. 15	156, 245
2 Cor. x. 14	90, 342*, 384, 396, 431,	2 Cor. xii. 17	158, 574*
" " "	474*, 484	2 Cor. xii. 18	219
2 Cor. x. 15	331	2 Cor. xii. 19	155, 209, 383*, 508
2 Cor. x. 16	109, 318, 587	2 Cor. xii. 20	65, 176, 219, 453*, 504, 556*
2 Cor. x. 18	78, 87	2 Cor. xii. 21	163, 207, 222, 343, 393, 482,
		" " "	494, 504, 554*, 635*
2 Cor. xi. 1	72, 302*, 442	2 Cor. xiii. 1	250*, 265, 375, 440, 625
2 Cor. xi. 2	117, 185, 258, 318, 534	2 Cor. xiii. 2	128
2 Cor. xi. 3	133, 370, 504, 541, 621	2 Cor. xiii. 3	411, 418
2 Cor. xi. 4	72, 109, 306*	2 Cor. xiii. 4	86, 388*, 442, 541
2 Cor. xi. 5	196*, 422, 446	2 Cor. xiii. 5	626
2 Cor. xi. 6	398*, 442, 580, 585*	2 Cor. xiii. 7	212, 321, 460*, 495, 513,
2 Cor. xi. 7	208, 509*	" " "	555*, 617
2 Cor. xi. 8	44, 405, 499	2 Cor. xiii. 8	382, 594
2 Cor. xi. 9	134*	2 Cor. xiii. 9	155, 161, 529
2 Cor. xi. 10	248*, 397, 449, 456*	2 Cor. xiii. 10	278, 494
2 Cor. xi. 11	582		
2 Cor. xi. 12	158, 286	Gal. i. 1	122, 371, 378, 379, 418*
2 Cor. xi. 13	111, 513	Gal. i. 3	124, 139
2 Cor. xi. 14	112	Gal. i. 4	133, 383, 412, 525
2 Cor. xi. 16	321, 583, 584, 605	Gal. i. 5	108
2 Cor. xi. 17	401	Gal. i. 6	638
2 Cor. xi. 18	117, 233	Gal. i. 7	109, 118, 513
2 Cor. xi. 20	255*, 609	Gal. i. 8	159, 295, 296, 517, 518*
2 Cor. xi. 21	40, 402*, 563, 618	Gal. i. 10	80, 304, 509
2 Cor. xi. 22	454	Gal. i. 11	402, 549
2 Cor. xi. 23	176, 217, 243, 423*, 466, 578*	Gal. i. 12	489, 492*
2 Cor. xi. 24	369, 578, 589	Gal. i. 13	269*
2 Cor. xi. 25	74, 272*	Gal. i. 14	70, 243, 403
2 Cor. xi. 26	188*, 217, 578, 609	Gal. i. 15	367
2 Cor. xi. 27	578	Gal. i. 16	218*, 552
2 Cor. xi. 28	533*	Gal. i. 18	428
2 Cor. xi. 29	153*	Gal. i. 19	113, 633*
2 Cor. xi. 30	222, 538	Gal. i. 20	449
2 Cor. xi. 32	60, 61, 138	Gal. i. 22	215, 390
2 Cor. xi. 33	429, 606	Gal. i. 23	108, 353*, 545, 631*

Gal. i. 24	388	Gal. iv. 8	475, 486*
		Gal. iv. 9	263*, 604
Gal. ii. 1	60, 380*	Gal. iv. 10	253
Gal. ii. 2	353, 380, 443, 504*, 632*	Gal. iv. 11	503*, 626
Gal. ii. 4	255, 289, 545, 569*	Gal. iv. 12	227
Gal. ii. 5	236	Gal. iv. 13	71, 223, 400*
Gal. ii. 6	170*, 568*	Gal. iv. 15	84, 305, 585
Gal. ii. 7	46, 229, 260*, 271*	Gal. iv. 17	289*, 638
Gal. ii. 8	258, 397, 562, 565	Gal. iv. 18	320, 329
Gal. ii. 9	152, 587*, 592, 613	Gal. iv. 19	141
Gal. ii. 10	142, 149*, 550	Gal. iv. 20	283, 330
Gal. ii. 11	343*	Gal. iv. 21	407, 537
Gal. ii. 12	446	Gal. iv. 22	173
Gal. ii. 13	216, 301	Gal. iv. 23	104
Gal. ii. 14	45, 236, 405	Gal. iv. 24	118, 248, 562, 576
Gal. ii. 15	521	Gal. iv. 25	109*, 112, 179*
Gal. ii. 16	171, 186, 266, 280	Gal. iv. 26	576
Gal. ii. 17	120, 500, 510*, 616*	Gal. iv. 27	240, 485*
Gal. ii. 18	87	Gal. iv. 28	192, 402*
Gal. ii. 19	210, 428	Gal. iv. 30	506
Gal. ii. 20	168, 327, 619	Gal. iv. 31	445
Gal. ii. 21	123, 558		
Gal. iii. 1	75, 83, 135*, 149*, 183, 223	Gal. v. 1	210
" " "	400, 537, 549	Gal. v. 2	227, 521
Gal. iii. 2	365, 509	Gal. v. 4	73, 427, 429, 621
Gal. iii. 7	424*, 445	Gal. v. 6	120
Gal. iii. 8	71, 114, 411	Gal. v. 7	604
Gal. iii. 9	301, 391	Gal. v. 8	637
Gal. iii. 10	325, 368, 407	Gal. v. 10	137, 214, 321
Gal. iii. 11	123, 136, 186	Gal. v. 11	558
Gal. iii. 13	383	Gal. v. 12	255, 302, 638
Gal. iii. 14	237*	Gal. v. 13	394, 596*
Gal. iii. 15	192, 402, 444, 553*	Gal. v. 14	109, 151, 549
Gal. iii. 16	166*, 375, 522	Gal. v. 16	219, 506
Gal. iii. 17	596, 250, 396	Gal. v. 17	307*, 460
Gal. iii. 18	123, 619	Gal. v. 19	515
Gal. iii. 19	124, 297, 379*	Gal. v. 20	65, 176
Gal. iii. 20	116, 593*	Gal. v. 21	200
Gal. iii. 21	123, 139, 304, 508	Gal. v. 26	209, 476, 502*
Gal. iii. 22	186, 397		
Gal. iii. 23	334, 396, 550, 558	Gal. vi. 1	537, 580, 626
Gal. iii. 26	122, 213, 234	Gal. vi. 3	170*, 613
Gal. iii. 28	80, 552	Gal. vi. 6	110, 114
Gal. iii. 29	445	Gal. vi. 7	310
		Gal. vi. 9	483, 502
Gal. iv. 1	106	Gal. vi. 10	284, 448
Gal. iv. 2	407	Gal. vi. 11	278
Gal. iv. 3	80	Gal. vi. 12	216, 290
Gal. iv. 4	86	Gal. vi. 13	233, 287, 332
Gal. iv. 5	123	Gal. vi. 14	123, 319
Gal. iv. 6	580	Gal. vi. 16	437
Gal. iv. 7	301, 379, 580	Gal. vi. 17	153, 207

Eph. i. 3	410, 517, 551, 586	Eph. iii. 11	167, 256
Eph. i. 4	125, 342, 386	Eph. iii. 12	128, 137, 167, 186
Eph. i. 5	342, 378, 402, 611	Eph. iii. 18	136, 166*, 234, 388
Eph. i. 6	125, 163, 190	Eph. iii. 14	404, 566*, 688
Eph. i. 7	389*, 528	Eph. iii. 15	111*, 116, 121, 615
Eph. i. 8	111*, 163, 164*	Eph. iii. 16	65, 78, 290*, 319, 378, 397, 417*
Eph. i. 9	152, 342	Eph. iii. 18	128, 144, 331, 340, 572*
Eph. i. 10	397, 528	Eph. iii. 19	185, 217*, 346*, 638
Eph. i. 11	258, 262	Eph. iii. 20	158
Eph. i. 12	58, 125, 134*	Eph. iii. 21	108
Eph. i. 13	213, 216, 528, 562, 586*		
Eph. i. 14	166, 410, 531	Eph. iv. 1	136*, 152, 163, 332, 888*, 566*
Eph. i. 15	133, 135, 137, 154*, 234	Eph. iv. 2	202, 572*
Eph. i. 16	256, 376, 383, 412	Eph. iv. 3	386, 572*
Eph. i. 17	78, 152, 290, 416	Eph. iv. 4	417, 584
Eph. i. 18	108, 298, 572, 584	Eph. iv. 6	375, 419*
Eph. i. 19	134, 190, 421, 529, 611	Eph. iv. 7	401
Eph. i. 20	125, 218*, 235, 384, 430, 573, 592	Eph. iv. 8	225, 522
Eph. i. 21	420, 421, 527, 566, 615	Eph. iv. 9	69, 243, 531*, 592
Eph. i. 23	114, 166, 167*, 258*, 260*	Eph. iv. 11	104
" " "	513, 533, 638	Eph. iv. 12	144, 157, 411, 615
Eph. ii. 1	126, 412, 611	Eph. iv. 13	190*, 297, 528
Eph. ii. 2	238*, 401, 634*	Eph. iv. 14	460*, 477
Eph. ii. 3	80, 127, 176, 191*, 215*, 238,	Eph. iv. 15	397
" " "	386, 410, 550*, 573*	Eph. iv. 16	256, 386
Eph. ii. 4	201*, 225, 399, 443	Eph. iv. 17	161, 514, 526
Eph. ii. 5	218*, 565	Eph. iv. 18	186*, 189, 215, 428, 526*
Eph. ii. 6	235, 278	Eph. iv. 19	213
Eph. ii. 7	65, 137, 254, 410	Eph. iv. 21	199*, 391*
Eph. ii. 8	192, 217*, 411, 562	Eph. iv. 22	318, 321*, 322*, 342, 347*,
Eph. ii. 9	439, 477	" " "	410
Eph. ii. 10	149*, 155, 163, 192, 386, 394	Eph. iv. 23	215, 263*, 611
Eph. ii. 11	135, 313, 562, 566*, 578, 582, 602	Eph. iv. 25	313, 342, 528
Eph. ii. 12	177*, 194, 197, 428, 465, 477,	Eph. iv. 26	120, 311*, 313, 494*, 584
" " "	566, 578	Eph. iv. 27	312, 491*
Eph. ii. 13	118, 341, 578	Eph. iv. 28	234, 313, 353*, 501
Eph. ii. 14	114, 181, 228, 531	Eph. iv. 29	172, 363, 593
Eph. ii. 15	136, 138, 220*, 386, 388, 528, 621	Eph. iv. 30	125, 396
Eph. ii. 16	342, 476*	Eph. iv. 31	312
Eph. ii. 17	607*, 609		
Eph. ii. 19	558	Eph. v. 2	386, 438, 605*
Eph. ii. 20	128, 130, 185, 431	Eph. v. 3	441, 485*, 615*
Eph. ii. 21	83, 111*, 136, 149*, 193, 342, 396	Eph. v. 4	270
Eph. ii. 22	122, 317	Eph. v. 5	122, 128, 166, 167, 172*, 265,
		" " "	355*, 518
Eph. iii. 1	189, 521, 566*	Eph. v. 6	501
Eph. iii. 2	448, 560, 634	Eph. v. 8	258
Eph. iii. 4	136	Eph. v. 9	184*, 562, 565
Eph. iii. 5	128, 218, 221, 566*	Eph. v. 11	143, 521
Eph. iii. 6	318*, 389	Eph. v. 12	47, 141, 146*, 319
Eph. iii. 8	65, 69, 242, 319, 362	Eph. v. 13	258*
Eph. iii. 10	128, 235*, 362, 459*	Eph. v. 14	79, 90, 123, 312, 431
	90	Eph. v. 15	300*, 474*, 610

Eph. v. 17	584, 610	Phil. i. 15	559
Eph. v. 18	217	Phil. i. 16	184, 332, 368, 561
Eph. v. 19	312*, 216, 351	Phil. i. 17	184, 209, 332, 368, 431
Eph. v. 20	351, 383	Phil. i. 18	90, 157, 216, 217*, 232, 387, 585
Eph. v. 21	186, 351*	Phil. i. 19	128, 129
Eph. v. 22	154, 351	Phil. i. 20	128
Eph. v. 23	122, 451, 530	Phil. i. 21	320, 333
Eph. v. 24	440, 451*, 582*	Phil. i. 22	160, 169, 299*, 513
Eph. v. 26	30, 123, 138*	Phil. i. 23	240*, 245, 329*, 397, 578
Eph. v. 27	482, 545, 577	Phil. i. 25	128, 161, 397
Eph. v. 28	150	Phil. i. 26	136, 234, 287, 410, 466
Eph. v. 29	278	Phil. i. 27	109, 211, 477
Eph. v. 31	183, 262, 364*, 432*	Phil. i. 28	166, 211, 477, 482
Eph. v. 32	153*, 397, 443	Phil. i. 29	259, 320, 513
Eph. v. 33	249, 315, 577	Phil. i. 30	112, 572
Eph. vi. 1	182, 390, 537	Phil. ii. 1	122, 526
Eph. vi. 2	126, 316, 391*, 562	Phil. ii. 2	155, 337, 525
Eph. vi. 3	289*	Phil. ii. 3	533, 537*
Eph. vi. 4	189*, 313, 388*	Phil. ii. 4	477, 482, 498
Eph. vi. 5	138, 537, 401*	Phil. ii. 5	582
Eph. vi. 6	402	Phil. ii. 6	177*, 209, 323*
Eph. vi. 8	310, 365, 552, 621	Phil. ii. 7	342, 345, 387, 616
Eph. vi. 9	192	Phil. ii. 8	122, 215, 257, 443
Eph. vi. 10	264, 537	Phil. ii. 9	140*, 438
Eph. vi. 11	176, 189*	Phil. ii. 10	191*, 235*, 390*
Eph. vi. 12	235, 239*, 421, 496, 552, 609	Phil. ii. 11	122, 124, 551
Eph. vi. 13	132, 189*, 313	Phil. ii. 12	151, 301, 313, 476*, 477, 493, 594
Eph. vi. 14	174, 432, 531	Phil. ii. 13	114, 350*, 383*, 430, 513
Eph. vi. 15	416	Phil. ii. 15	122, 123, 141, 317, 471
Eph. vi. 16	108, 134*, 384, 393, 531	Phil. ii. 16	125, 410, 606
Eph. vi. 17	709, 123, 166, 313	Phil. ii. 17	128, 393
Eph. vi. 18	122, 383, 410, 412, 437, 631	Phil. ii. 18	40, 227
Eph. vi. 20	384*, 386	Phil. ii. 19	331, 344
Eph. vi. 21	126, 136, 401*	Phil. ii. 20	300
Eph. vi. 22	161	Phil. ii. 22	317, 422*, 577*
Eph. vi. 23	124, 377	Phil. ii. 23	45, 308*, 331
Phil. i. 1	136, 587	Phil. ii. 25	49, 192
Phil. i. 2	122	Phil. ii. 27	221, 288, 408*, 471
Phil. i. 3	110, 392*, 393	Phil. ii. 28	70, 243*, 278, 346*, 548
Phil. i. 4	256, 637	Phil. ii. 29	228
Phil. i. 5	109, 124, 126, 193	Phil. ii. 30	93, 122, 191
Phil. i. 6	143, 161, 227	Phil. iii. 2	223*, 609, 638
Phil. i. 7	128, 148, 319, 329*, 383, 420,	Phil. iii. 3	114, 209, 214, 216, 233, 485*,
" " "	439, 543, 627*	" " "	529, 593, 638
Phil. i. 8	189*, 204, 388	Phil. iii. 4	344, 582
Phil. i. 9	240, 336, 386, 416*	Phil. iii. 5	196, 215, 520
Phil. i. 10	416	Phil. iii. 6	65, 123, 140, 402
Phil. i. 11	133, 140, 201, 229, 378	Phil. iii. 7	160, 168, 228, 274*, 281
Phil. i. 12	243*, 332, 549	Phil. iii. 8	229, 235, 442*
Phil. i. 13	63, 578	Phil. iii. 9	122, 133, 137, 139, 186, 390,
Phil. i. 14	137*, 243	" " "	392, 477, 482, 616

Phil. iii. 10	439, 92, 129, 189, 325*, 572	Col. i. 24	136, 166, 167, 189, 232, 382
Phil. iii. 12	262, 263, 276*, 394, 638	Col. i. 26	227, 573
Phil. iii. 13	321*	Col. i. 27	166*, 168, 330
Phil. iii. 14	136, 205, 400*, 407, 431*, 620	Col. i. 28	167, 609
Phil. iii. 15	280*, 285*, 585	Col. i. 29	167, 258, 397, 410
Phil. iii. 16	90, 316*, 513		
Phil. iii. 17	549	Col. ii. 1	76, 453
Phil. iii. 18	532, 573, 183, 222, 530, 628	Col. ii. 2	58, 65, 410, 572*
Phil. iii. 19	114, 183, 532, 564	Col. ii. 5	155, 215, 236, 292, 442, 444, 469*
Phil. iii. 20	124, 139, 141*, 155, 446,	Col. ii. 7	216, 343, 431
" " "	453*, 551	Col. ii. 8	109, 128, 401, 437, 503*, 520
Phil. iii. 21	324, 528, 624	Col. ii. 9	546
		Col. ii. 10	573
Phil. iv. 1	301, 390, 523, 530, 537	Col. ii. 11	144, 157, 189*, 216
Phil. iv. 3	69, 125, 313, 439, 545, 584	Col. ii. 12	123, 190, 340
Phil. iv. 4	537	Col. ii. 13	127, 148, 218, 342, 391, 412,
Phil. iv. 5	219, 235, 585	" " "	344, 433, 602
Phil. iv. 6	128, 212, 405	Col. ii. 14	47, 138, 220, 271
Phil. iv. 7	126, 186*, 280*	Col. ii. 15	141, 258
Phil. iv. 8	160, 609	Col. ii. 16	420, 502, 552, 615*
Phil. iv. 9	160, 280*, 313	Col. ii. 17	166, 532*
Phil. iv. 10	87, 233, 317*, 323, 382, 546	Col. ii. 18	187*, 190, 232, 248*, 369,
Phil. iv. 11	152, 158, 159, 321, 347, 386,	" " "	467*, 480*
" " "	402*, 597	Col. ii. 19	83, 128, 141, 202, 224, 247*, 485*
Phil. iv. 12	77, 180, 318, 520	Col. ii. 20	209, 252, 261, 370, 391, 428
Phil. iv. 14	155, 345	Col. ii. 21	488, 501, 594
Phil. iv. 15	84, 193, 200, 602	Col. ii. 22	127
Phil. iv. 16	228*, 414*	Col. ii. 23	349, 575*
Phil. iv. 17	597, 606		
Phil. iv. 18	237*, 275*, 366*, 452, 528,	Col. iii. 1	292
" " "	530, 631	Col. iii. 3	271, 272, 391
Phil. iv. 19	65, 137, 280*	Col. iii. 4	530
Phil. iv. 21	137	Col. iii. 5	117*, 166*, 167, 313, 531*, 553
Phil. iv. 22	629	Col. iii. 6	265*
		Col. iii. 7	269, 386
Col. i. 3	344*, 412	Col. iii. 8	107*, 116, 120
Col. i. 4	135	Col. iii. 9	397
Col. i. 6	137, 573	Col. iii. 11	80, 440, 520, 552
Col. i. 7	60, 103, 382	Col. iii. 12	176, 565, 611
Col. i. 8	122, 135*, 390*	Col. iii. 13	440, 565*
Col. i. 9	137, 412	Col. iii. 14	166*, 393, 565
Col. i. 12	136	Col. iii. 15	186*, 438
Col. i. 13	237, 259	Col. iii. 16	432, 566, 572
Col. i. 14	189	Col. iii. 17	126, 307, 378, 420
Col. i. 15	54, 124	Col. iii. 18	182, 270*
Col. i. 16	116*, 235, 272*, 389, 419*	Col. iii. 23	307
Col. i. 17	150, 419*	Col. iii. 24	370*, 371, 531
Col. i. 18	123	Col. iii. 25	620*
Col. i. 19	71, 588		
Col. i. 20	178, 187*, 190, 212*, 397	Col. iv. 1	126, 257
Col. i. 21	132, 216, 341, 443, 571	Col. iv. 2	386, 410, 433
Col. i. 22	188*, 318	Col. iv. 3	517
Col. i. 23	124, 448, 475*	Col. iv. 5	405, 424

Col. iv. 6	298, 316*, 318*, 585	1 Thess. iv. 1	109, 432, 518
Col. iv. 9	75	1 Thess. iv. 2	84, 379*
Col. iv. 10	60, 565	1 Thess. iv. 3	319*, 427, 513, 529
Col. iv. 11	84, 513	1 Thess. iv. 4	274
Col. iv. 12	103, 111*	1 Thess. iv. 5	134, 139, 496
Col. iv. 14	103	1 Thess. iv. 6	53, 85, 115*, 171, 320, 433
Col. iv. 15	102, 145	1 Thess. iv. 7	394*, 411, 417*
Col. iv. 16	107*, 337, 395, 550, 629*	1 Thess. iv. 8	497*
Col. iv. 17	85, 626	1 Thess. iv. 9	56, 324, 339*
Col. iv. 18	155	1 Thess. iv. 10	133, 332
		1 Thess. iv. 14	541*
1 Thess. i. 1	136	1 Thess. iv. 15	387*, 506, 507*
1 Thess. i. 2	256, 344, 373, 376	1 Thess. iv. 16	135*, 150, 247*, 335, 390, 431
1 Thess. i. 3	155, 187*, 190, 205, 615*	1 Thess. iv. 17	83, 135*, 391
1 Thess. i. 5	420	1 Thess. iv. 18	301
1 Thess. i. 6	550		
1 Thess. i. 7	111, 130, 175*	1 Thess. v. 1	339
1 Thess. i. 8	133, 145, 420, 480	1 Thess. v. 2	139*
1 Thess. i. 9	122, 145, 298	1 Thess. v. 3	65, 506, 541
1 Thess. i. 10	123, 134, 353, 594	1 Thess. v. 4	460*
		1 Thess. v. 5	195*, 196
1 Thess. ii. 1	133, 626	1 Thess. v. 6	286, 502
1 Thess. ii. 3	368, 411, 493*	1 Thess. v. 8	120, 125, 195*
1 Thess. ii. 4	271, 340	1 Thess. v. 10	294*, 391
1 Thess. ii. 5	120, 488, 565	1 Thess. v. 11	173
1 Thess. ii. 6	344, 411*	1 Thess. v. 12	335, 386*
1 Thess. ii. 7	307, 541	1 Thess. v. 14	202, 405, 534
1 Thess. ii. 8	101, 198*, 204, 331, 622*	1 Thess. v. 22	120, 427
1 Thess. ii. 9	205, 329, 482, 552, 587	1 Thess. v. 23	150, 286, 527
1 Thess. ii. 10	465	1 Thess. v. 24	353
1 Thess. ii. 12	128, 333	1 Thess. v. 27	226
1 Thess. ii. 13	122, 191, 258*, 465, 551		
1 Thess. ii. 14	46, 84, 154, 369, 390, 410	2 Thess. i. 1	136
1 Thess. ii. 15	355	2 Thess. i. 4	163, 383, 410, 533
1 Thess. ii. 16	90, 137, 155, 329, 452*,	2 Thess. i. 6	122, 448*
" " "	594, 604	2 Thess. i. 7	237*
1 Thess. ii. 17	243*, 427	2 Thess. i. 8	475*, 496
1 Thess. ii. 18	437	2 Thess. i. 9	125, 190, 371
1 Thess. ii. 19	155	2 Thess. i. 10	260, 386, 389, 565
1 Thess. ii. 20	446, 513	2 Thess. i. 11	206, 397
		2 Thess. i. 12	130*
1 Thess. iii. 1	483	2 Thess. ii. 1	383
1 Thess. iii. 2	113, 366	2 Thess. ii. 2	125, 274, 370, 378*, 421,
1 Thess. iii. 3	184, 328*	" " "	493, 618
1 Thess. iii. 5	483, 505*	2 Thess. ii. 3	106, 238, 239*, 499, 500,
1 Thess. iii. 6	371*	" " "	529, 545, 599*, 600
1 Thess. iii. 7	128	2 Thess. ii. 4	253, 626
1 Thess. iii. 8	295	2 Thess. ii. 6	178
1 Thess. iii. 9	57, 226	2 Thess. ii. 7	123, 258, 297, 550
1 Thess. iii. 10	155, 552	2 Thess. ii. 8	611, 639
1 Thess. iii. 11	139, 150, 316	2 Thess. ii. 9	60, 158, 386
1 Thess. iii. 13	155, 417*, 528, 624	2 Thess. ii. 10	189*
		2 Thess. ii. 11	236

2 Thess. ii. 12	332, 475, 477, 482	1 Tim. iii. 1	204, 537, 585
2 Thess. ii. 13	73, 124, 186, 417*, 527	1 Tim. iii. 2	117*, 525
2 Thess. ii. 15	202, 229, 558	1 Tim. iii. 4	117
2 Thess. ii. 16	69, 150	1 Tim. iii. 5	205, 279, 452*, 477, 563
2 Thess. ii. 17	155, 316	1 Tim. iii. 6	191*, 430
		1 Tim. iii. 12	117*
2 Thess. iii. 2	584	1 Tim. iii. 13	140
2 Thess. iii. 3	89	1 Tim. iii. 14	69, 243*, 331, 537
2 Thess. iii. 4	137, 233	1 Tim. iii. 15	166*, 243, 298, 627
2 Thess. iii. 5	118, 155, 185, 286, 316	1 Tim. iii. 16	123, 124, 260*, 413, 538,
2 Thess. iii. 6	77, 432	" " "	588*, 639*
2 Thess. iii. 7	298		
2 Thess. iii. 8	351*, 493	1 Tim. iv. 1	187*, 427, 428
2 Thess. iii. 9	597	1 Tim. iv. 3	139, 622*
2 Thess. iii. 10	161, 475, 476, 477, 478	1 Tim. iv. 4	343
2 Thess. iii. 11	274, 347, 638	1 Tim. iv. 6	128, 164
2 Thess. iii. 12	143, 198, 381	1 Tim. iv. 7	257, 313, 405
2 Thess. iii. 13	345	1 Tim. iv. 8	140, 213
2 Thess. iii. 14	119*, 253, 477	1 Tim. iv. 10	410
2 Thess. iii. 15	228, 521, 527, 602	1 Tim. iv. 11	313, 537
2 Thess. iii. 16	150, 217	1 Tim. iv. 12	537
		1 Tim. iv. 13	296, 313, 520, 537
1 Tim. i. 1	139	1 Tim. iv. 14	205, 377*, 537
1 Tim. i. 2	137*	1 Tim. iv. 15	79, 155, 287, 385, 386,
1 Tim. i. 3	315, 321*, 433, 488, 566, 570*	" " "	520, 537
1 Tim. i. 4	140, 488	1 Tim. iv. 16	537
1 Tim. i. 5	139, 368, 570*		
1 Tim. i. 6	196	1 Tim. v. 1	527, 537
1 Tim. i. 7	169, 253, 488	1 Tim. v. 4	77, 347, 631*
1 Tim. i. 8	638	1 Tim. v. 5	130, 233, 409, 410, 433, 611
1 Tim. i. 9	161, 211, 638	1 Tim. v. 7	313
1 Tim. i. 10	520	1 Tim. v. 8	205, 230, 259, 477
1 Tim. i. 11	229	1 Tim. v. 9	477, 590*
1 Tim. i. 12	348*	1 Tim. v. 10	234, 387, 609
1 Tim. i. 13	341	1 Tim. v. 13	347*, 432, 490*
1 Tim. i. 14	133	1 Tim. v. 14	537
1 Tim. i. 15	107, 234, 585	1 Tim. v. 15	621
1 Tim. i. 16	288, 549	1 Tim. v. 16	83, 590
1 Tim. i. 18	224, 387*	1 Tim. v. 17	206
1 Tim. i. 19	406, 524	1 Tim. v. 18	585
1 Tim. i. 20	195*, 288	1 Tim. v. 19	64, 313, 375*, 420, 605
		1 Tim. v. 21	477
1 Tim. ii. 1	256, 332, 611	1 Tim. v. 22	200*, 209, 430, 501, 537
1 Tim. ii. 2	70, 386, 524, 593*	1 Tim. v. 23	127, 498*, 501, 537, 548
1 Tim. ii. 3	534	1 Tim. v. 24	171, 537, 559
1 Tim. ii. 4	553*	1 Tim. v. 25	514
1 Tim. ii. 6	58, 383, 533		
1 Tim. ii. 7	527, 562, 565, 610	1 Tim. vi. 1	407, 537
1 Tim. ii. 8	68*, 283, 321, 332, 544	1 Tim. vi. 2	143, 202, 502, 521
1 Tim. ii. 9	68	1 Tim. vi. 3	56, 57, 537
1 Tim. ii. 10	158*	1 Tim. vi. 4	406, 518
1 Tim. ii. 12	122, 206	1 Tim. vi. 5	78, 102, 196, 229, 427, 428
1 Tim. ii. 15	293, 516*, 631*	1 Tim. vi. 6	546
		1 Tim. ii. 13	464

1 Tim. vi. 7	585	2 Tim. iii. 15	120, 370
1 Tim. vi. 8	75	2 Tim. iii. 16	96*, 213, 416
1 Tim. vi. 9	525		
1 Tim. vi. 11	120, 183, 313	2 Tim. iv. 1	537, 552, 630
1 Tim. vi. 12	202, 224, 312*	2 Tim. iv. 2	79, 314, 520*
1 Tim. vi. 13	107, 375	2 Tim. iv. 3	83, 481
1 Tim. vi. 15	246	2 Tim. iv. 6	152, 274
1 Tim. vi. 17	136*, 192*, 236*, 273, 334	2 Tim. iv. 7	132, 224, 523, 638
1 Tim. vi. 18	201	2 Tim. iv. 8	273*
1 Tim. vi. 19	202	2 Tim. iv. 9	602
1 Tim. vi. 20	183, 253, 314, 549	2 Tim. iv. 10	103
		2 Tim. iv. 13	22, 395
2 Tim. i. 1	402	2 Tim. iv. 14	78
2 Tim. i. 3	372*, 448*	2 Tim. iv. 15	223, 314
2 Tim. i. 4	155, 544	2 Tim. iv. 16	476, 501
2 Tim. i. 5	582*	2 Tim. iv. 17	74, 259, 514
2 Tim. i. 8	189, 314	2 Tim. iv. 18	621*
2 Tim. i. 10	116, 139, 534	2 Tim. iv. 20	219
2 Tim. i. 11	527	2 Tim. iv. 21	372
2 Tim. i. 12	319, 396, 438		
2 Tim. i. 13	139	Titus i. 1	402, 565*
2 Tim. i. 14	140, 314	Titus i. 2	565*
2 Tim. i. 15	195	Titus i. 3	534*, 565*, 568*
2 Tim. i. 16	73, 78	Titus i. 5	112, 258*, 288
2 Tim. i. 17	219	Titus i. 6	117*, 139, 386, 477, 525
2 Tim. i. 18	78, 242*, 321, 365*	Titus i. 7	192
		Titus i. 9	202
2 Tim. ii. 1	133, 153, 313	Titus i. 10	368
2 Tim. ii. 2	160, 319, 378*	Titus i. 11	332, 480*
2 Tim. ii. 3	314	Titus i. 12	69, 154*, 640*
2 Tim. ii. 4	287	Titus i. 13	217, 313
2 Tim. ii. 5	477, 556*	Titus i. 15	88, 155, 518, 559*
2 Tim. ii. 6	556*		
2 Tim. ii. 7	78, 286	Titus ii. 2	217, 322
2 Tim. ii. 8	313	Titus ii. 4	290, 525
2 Tim. ii. 10	140, 234, 287, 605	Titus ii. 5	101, 154
2 Tim. ii. 11	86, 143, 585	Titus ii. 7	228, 257*, 406
		Titus ii. 8	64, 424, 477, 591
2 Tim. ii. 14	313, 394, 533, 537, 624	Titus ii. 9	154, 482
2 Tim. ii. 16	78	Titus ii. 10	131, 432
2 Tim. ii. 18	334	Titus ii. 11	132
2 Tim. ii. 22	223*	Titus ii. 12	127, 344, 355
2 Tim. ii. 26	621	Titus ii. 13	130*, 344, 355, 544
		Titus ii. 14	197, 288
2 Tim. iii. 1	124		
2 Tim. iii. 2	520	Titus iii. 1	313
2 Tim. iii. 4	245, 638	Titus iii. 3	120, 593*
2 Tim. iii. 6	366	Titus iii. 4	139
2 Tim. iii. 8	66, 229, 230, 406	Titus iii. 5	66, 139, 163, 189, 193, 390*, 402
2 Tim. iii. 10	155	Titus iii. 6	163, 163, 378
2 Tim. iii. 11	74, 420	Titus iii. 7	157, 216
2 Tim. iii. 12	614*	Titus iii. 8	108, 205, 253
2 Tim. iii. 14	314, 365	Titus iii. 9	68, 78, 524

Titus iii. 12	102	Heb. iii. 1	194, 200, 314
Titus iii. 13	103, 313	Heb. iii. 2	60
Titus iii. 14	77	Heb. iii. 3	67, 190*, 206, 240*, 271, 404
Titus iii. 15	585	Heb. iii. 4	350, 562
		Heb. iii. 5	340*
Philem. 1	189*	Heb. iii. 6	126, 158, 409, 527
Philem. 4	256, 345	Heb. iii. 7	575
Philem. 5	139, 155, 410*	Heb. iii. 8	385, 401*
Philem. 6	338, 416, 462*	Heb. iii. 9	436
Philem. 9	189*	Heb. iii. 10	85, 450
Philem. 10	164, 628	Heb. iii. 11	462, 500
Philem. 11	278, 638	Heb. iii. 12	194*, 329, 416, 503, 538
Philem. 12	530	Heb. iii. 13	111, 151, 189*
Philem. 13	189*, 270, 283*, 383	Heb. iii. 15	571*
Philem. 14	270, 283*, 330, 463, 617	Heb. iii. 16	53, 378, 426, 442, 510, 571*
Philem. 16	403, 420	Heb. iii. 17	73, 230
Philem. 17	313	Heb. iii. 19	438
Philem. 18	85, 227, 292		
Philem. 19	278, 521	Heb. iv. 1	197, 319, 613
Philem. 20	137, 198, 286, 549, 638	Heb. iv. 2	87, 219*, 221, 229, 260, 475
Philem. 22	594	Heb. iv. 3	123, 134, 265, 343, 344, 462, 500
Philem. 23	519	Heb. iv. 4	271, 370, 522, 588, 590*
		Heb. iv. 7	113, 199, 385
Heb. i. 1	375*	Heb. iv. 8	146*, 304*
Heb. i. 2	176*, 228, 438, 527	Heb. iv. 9	445
Heb. i. 3	125, 187*, 216, 237*, 256, 344, 384	Heb. iv. 10	154, 421
Heb. i. 4	240, 245, 271	Heb. iv. 11	162, 386, 388, 550
Heb. i. 6	210, 308	Heb. iv. 12	240, 247
Heb. i. 7	352, 405*, 588	Heb. iv. 13	147*, 406*, 442
Heb. i. 8	182	Heb. iv. 14	202
Heb. i. 9	435, 226, 277*, 404	Heb. iv. 15	91, 143, 475, 483
Heb. i. 10	435	Heb. iv. 16	66, 397
Heb. i. 11	53, 266	Heb. v. 1	230, 382
Heb. i. 13	228, 271, 367*, 558, 605	Heb. v. 2	209, 229
Heb. i. 14	120	Heb. v. 3	410, 440, 593*
Heb. ii. 1	89, 242, 243	Heb. v. 4	106, 550, 582*
Heb. ii. 2	545	Heb. v. 5	318, 582*
Heb. ii. 3	205, 340, 379*, 545, 621	Heb. v. 6	592*
Heb. ii. 4	545	Heb. v. 7	152, 158, 197, 371, 621
Heb. ii. 6	89	Heb. v. 8	159, 166*, 344, 637
Heb. ii. 8	442, 446, 447*, 454	Heb. v. 10	229
Heb. ii. 9	198*, 343, 399*, 462*, 534, 551	Heb. v. 11	115*, 215, 319, 450
Heb. ii. 10	320, 343*, 409, 627	Heb. v. 12	59, 169, 190, 324, 339, 350*, 399*
Heb. ii. 11	366, 448*, 585	Heb. v. 13	200, 521, 562, 584*
Heb. ii. 13	582	Heb. v. 14	120, 195*, 399, 405, 528
Heb. ii. 14	200, 272*, 281, 288, 541, 552	Heb. vi. 1	188*, 482, 531, 550, 635
Heb. ii. 15	329*, 380	Heb. vi. 2	187*, 192*, 439, 550, 551*
Heb. ii. 16	202, 267*, 606	Heb. vi. 3	285
Heb. ii. 17	209, 227*, 230	Heb. vi. 4	122, 198*
Heb. ii. 18	159*, 387*	Heb. vi. 5	123, 198
		Heb. vi. 6	212, 319, 339, 343, 344, 396, 605

Heb. vi. 7	131, 139, 200, 343, 376, 399, 438	Heb. ix. 1	133, 435*, 575
Heb. vi. 8	195, 351*, 584	Heb. ix. 2	129, 140, 236, 435*, 446,
Heb. vi. 9	120, 202, 229	" "	636*
Heb. vi. 10	163, 205, 319, 343, 433, 630	Heb. ix. 3	177*, 246*, 403
Heb. vi. 11	321, 405, 544	Heb. ix. 4	67, 116, 158*, 385*
Heb. vi. 12	442	Heb. ix. 5	68, 320
Heb. vi. 13	222, 282, 575	Heb. ix. 6	267*
Heb. vi. 14	354*, 443	Heb. ix. 7	131, 203*, 577
Heb. vi. 16	88, 192, 222, 242, 382, 575*	Heb. ix. 8	176*, 187, 482
Heb. vi. 17	216, 235, 243, 254, 387*	Heb. ix. 9	166*, 401, 484*, 527
Heb. vi. 18	134, 202, 386*, 549	Heb. ix. 10	635*
Heb. vi. 19	66, 69, 549	Heb. ix. 11	189, 242, 410, 485, 524, 525, 530
Heb. vi. 20	472*	Heb. ix. 12	69, 73, 86, 154, 176*, 353,
		" "	380, 495, 524
Heb. vii. 1	110	Heb. ix. 13	405
Heb. vii. 2	351*, 412	Heb. ix. 14	75, 197
Heb. vii. 3	488	Heb. ix. 15	185*, 287, 392*
Heb. vii. 4	61, 412, 528, 534, 549*, 560*	Heb. ix. 16	551*, 584, 585
Heb. vii. 5	344, 486	Heb. ix. 17	297, 394*, 480*, 549
Heb. vii. 6	71, 177*, 271, 273*, 486*	Heb. ix. 18	271
Heb. vii. 7	178	Heb. ix. 19	74, 106, 193*, 401
Heb. vii. 8	340	Heb. ix. 20	163
Heb. vii. 9	273*, 317*, 378*, 449*	Heb. ix. 21	443
Heb. vii. 11	67, 261*, 304*, 482*, 562	Heb. ix. 22	388, 554*
Heb. vii. 12	123, 192, 424*, 447, 453*	Heb. ix. 23	58, 175, 177, 240, 585
Heb. vii. 13	370, 409, 433, 447	Heb. ix. 24	318, 528
Heb. vii. 14	271, 397, 447	Heb. ix. 25	384, 401*
Heb. vii. 15	240*	Heb. ix. 26	271, 283*, 392*
Heb. vii. 16	98, 99	Heb. ix. 27	319
Heb. vii. 17	522, 588		
Heb. vii. 19	178	Heb. x. 1	163, 550
Heb. vii. 20	104, 565*, 586	Heb. x. 2	43, 134, 303*, 329, 345, 482, 508
Heb. vii. 21	377, 610	Heb. x. 4	584
Heb. vii. 23	329	Heb. x. 5	253, 277*
Heb. vii. 24	108*, 143, 330, 528	Heb. x. 6	71, 222, 277*, 583*
Heb. vii. 25	382	Heb. x. 7	182, 183, 325
Heb. vii. 26	197, 438*	Heb. x. 8	71, 222, 351*, 563*, 533*
Heb. vii. 27	154*, 421	Heb. x. 9	244
Heb. vii. 28	228	Heb. x. 10	138*, 387*, 389
		Heb. x. 12	344
Heb. viii. 1	384, 534, 574	Heb. x. 13	297, 344
Heb. viii. 2	163, 176*	Heb. x. 14	271
Heb. viii. 3	299	Heb. x. 16	225, 351*, 573
Heb. viii. 4	40, 121, 304, 589	Heb. x. 17	506
Heb. viii. 5	191, 260, 271, 285, 522, 562,	Heb. x. 18	584
" "	588, 595	Heb. x. 20	528
Heb. viii. 6	89, 261, 271, 524	Heb. x. 21	409
Heb. viii. 7	304	Heb. x. 22	73, 74, 75, 229, 621
Heb. viii. 8	146*, 209, 436	Heb. x. 24	185, 397
Heb. viii. 9	225, 401, 430, 571*	Heb. x. 25	151, 245, 477, 582
Heb. viii. 10	184, 225, 352, 573*	Heb. x. 27	170*
Heb. viii. 11	174, 507*	Heb. x. 28	392*, 420
Heb. viii. 13	195, 271	Heb. x. 29	524, 562

Heb. x. 30	549	Heb. xii. 10	200, 268, 405, 409
Heb. x. 32	205	Heb. xii. 11	196*, 531, 550, 559
Heb. x. 33	142	Heb. xii. 13	641*
Heb. x. 34	155, 524, 549	Heb. xii. 15	22, 197*, 252*, 504
Heb. x. 36	192	Heb. xii. 16	206, 364
Heb. x. 37	247*, 355, 585, 610	Heb. xii. 17	147*, 317, 377
Heb. x. 38	136*, 156, 523*, 583*	Heb. xii. 18	566, 609, 66, 216*, 343*
Heb. x. 39	196	Heb. xii. 19	259, 433, 604
		Heb. xii. 20	201, 316, 566*
Heb. xi. 1	59*, 484, 485, 546	Heb. xii. 21	566*
Heb. xi. 2	260, 386, 387*, 412	Heb. xii. 22	432, 528, 566*, 609*
Heb. xi. 3	329, 334, 539, 555*	Heb. xii. 23	134
Heb. xi. 4	240	Heb. xii. 24	240
Heb. xi. 5	71, 325	Heb. xii. 25	259, 478, 582, 594, 633*
Heb. xi. 6	319	Heb. xii. 26	262
Heb. xi. 7	193*, 344, 402*, 484	Heb. xii. 27	108, 460, 477
Heb. xi. 8	70, 228, 268, 298, 483		
Heb. xi. 9	376	Heb. xiii. 2	205, 467*
Heb. xi. 11	150*, 404	Heb. xiii. 4	585*
Heb. xi. 12	120, 132, 162, 215, 589*	Heb. xiii. 5	232, 507*, 585, 588
Heb. xi. 13	268, 403*	Heb. xiii. 7	191
Heb. xi. 15	305*, 319	Heb. xiii. 8	552
Heb. xi. 16	204, 221, 530	Heb. xiii. 9	391*, 495, 496
Heb. xi. 17	549, 114, 269*, 437, 639	Heb. xiii. 10	199, 366*
Heb. xi. 18	405, 616*	Heb. xiii. 11	165, 168
Heb. xi. 19	584	Heb. xiii. 12	154
Heb. xi. 20	71	Heb. xiii. 13	559, 189*, 342*
Heb. xi. 21	71, 341	Heb. xiii. 15	64, 209, 530
Heb. xi. 22	63, 205	Heb. xiii. 16	205, 260
Heb. xi. 23	230	Heb. xiii. 17	143, 156, 382, 494
Heb. xi. 26	228, 239, 384*, 592, 622	Heb. xiii. 18	373, 517, 614
		Heb. xiii. 19	517, 69, 243*
Heb. xi. 28	92, 106, 147*, 201, 272, 353	Heb. xiii. 20	133, 134, 137
Heb. xi. 29	121, 251, 409, 431, 524	Heb. xiii. 22	202, 378*, 423*, 592*
Heb. xi. 30	67, 408	Heb. xiii. 23	69, 243*, 317, 346*
Heb. xi. 32	280*, 439, 550*	Heb. xiii. 24	109, 629*
Heb. xi. 33	120		
Heb. xi. 34	62	James i. 1	133, 316, 588
Heb. xi. 35	288, 353*, 367, 460*, 485*	James i. 2	111, 432
Heb. xi. 37	62, 520	James i. 3	235
Heb. xi. 38	116	James i. 4	477
Heb. xi. 39	381*, 412*	James i. 5	201, 482, 494, 610
Heb. xi. 40	258*	James i. 6	274, 443, 447
		James i. 7	446*, 447, 502, 534
Heb. xii. 1	344, 379, 423*, 432	James i. 8	528, 534*
Heb. xii. 2	125, 206, 271, 364*, 435, 622	James i. 9	132, 622*
Heb. xii. 3	215, 230, 234, 429, 454*, 477	James i. 10	622*
Heb. xii. 4	405, 429	James i. 11	75, 277*, 470*
Heb. xii. 5	205	James i. 12	531, 585
Heb. xii. 6	168, 443	James i. 13	97, 194*, 371*
Heb. xii. 7	122, 300, 397, 481	James i. 14	369
Heb. xii. 8	445, 610	James i. 15	88
Heb. xii. 9	221, 228, 436, 527	James i. 16	537

James i. 17	54, 80, 189, 348, 395, 527,	James iv. 2	256, 470*, 482, 594
" " "	537, 641*	James iv. 3	256
James i. 18	88, 170*, 537	James iv. 4	179*, 229, 307
James i. 19	301, 329, 520, 538	James iv. 5	425*
James i. 21	120	James iv. 7	223, 312*, 537
James i. 23	160, 274, 479, 610	James iv. 8	312, 313, 537
James i. 24	278*, 281, 446	James iv. 9	313, 537, 639
James i. 25	140, 237, 388	James iv. 10	257, 261, 537
James i. 26	68, 125, 192, 477	James iv. 13	117*, 162*, 249, 285
James i. 27	89, 161, 319, 529	" " "	516, 517
James ii. 1	60, 176, 186	James iv. 14	109, 140, 447, 565, 590
James ii. 2	446, 572*	James iv. 15	286*, 329*, 541
James ii. 3	81, 106, 153, 430	James iv. 17	147, 483, 494
James ii. 4	60, 185, 187*, 508, 572*	James v. 1	341, 516, 537
James ii. 5	163, 189*, 201, 212, 228, 510	James v. 2	274*, 537
James ii. 6	86, 174, 206, 278*	James v. 3	60, 89, 124, 212, 537, 539
James ii. 9	342, 353*	James v. 4	76, 371*, 537
James ii. 10	168, 202, 280, 308*, 447, 582	James v. 5	156*, 414, 416*, 537
James ii. 11	293, 479*	James v. 6	106, 174, 520, 537
James ii. 12	313, 378	James v. 7	308, 314, 592*
James ii. 13	100*, 203*, 432, 483	James v. 8	537
James ii. 14	108, 321, 585	James v. 9	372, 537
James ii. 15	350*, 452, 518	James v. 10	228, 527, 537
James ii. 16	580, 585	James v. 11	247*
James ii. 17	116	James v. 12	59, 79, 88, 222, 313, 372*,
James ii. 18	60, 280*, 367	" " "	442, 476, 488
James ii. 19	514, 541	James v. 13	169*, 285*, 541*
James ii. 20	116, 183	James v. 14	408*
James ii. 22	270, 433	James v. 16	309
James ii. 23	453*, 615	James v. 17	325, 466
James ii. 25	106, 219, 344, 571	James v. 18	84, 436
James ii. 26	116*, 440	James v. 20	122, 197
James iii. 1	242	1 Pet. i. 1	112, 113
James iii. 2	479	1 Pet. i. 2	122, 137*, 188*, 237*, 286
James iii. 3	192, 541, 549, 599*	1 Pet. i. 3	134, 402, 551
James iii. 4	307, 344, 472, 604	1 Pet. i. 4	520, 525, 611
James iii. 5	524, 548	1 Pet. i. 5	124, 332, 389
James iii. 6	54, 134	1 Pet. i. 6	232, 317
James iii. 7	132, 219*	1 Pet. i. 7	139*, 235*, 340, 378, 385, 459
James iii. 8	532*, 536	1 Pet. i. 8	226, 466, 485*
James iii. 9	222, 388	1 Pet. i. 9	156*, 342*
James iii. 10	332	1 Pet. i. 10	355
James iii. 11	128, 591	1 Pet. i. 11	193*
James iii. 12	493*	1 Pet. i. 12	82, 134, 355, 495
James iii. 13	511, 137*, 169, 313, 611	1 Pet. i. 13	314, 343, 409, 477, 550
James iii. 14	174, 432, 470, 494*, 511*	1 Pet. i. 14	238, 352*, 477
James iii. 15	350*	1 Pet. i. 15	111*, 402
James iii. 17	576	1 Pet. i. 17	353
James iii. 18	219	1 Pet. i. 18	133, 216, 525, 527*
James iv. 1	161, 529	1 Pet. i. 19	525
James iv. 11	313	1 Pet. i. 20	123, 376

1 Pet. i. 21	529	1 Pet. iv. 1	120, 196, 217, 262*, 263*, 271,
1 Pet. i. 22	186, 389	" " "	313, 412*
1 Pet. i. 23	340, 366, 411, 421, 549, 610	1 Pet. iv. 2	84, 225, 226, 230, 329, 482
1 Pet. i. 24	277	1 Pet. iv. 3	176, 209, 219, 262, 318, 319,
1 Pet. i. 25	213	" " "	334, 520, 627*
1 Pet. ii. 1	176, 527	1 Pet. iv. 4	484, 549
1 Pet. ii. 2	204, 314	1 Pet. iv. 5	552
1 Pet. ii. 3	448*	1 Pet. iv. 6	123, 223, 281, 402*, 441, 522,
1 Pet. ii. 4	122, 421, 427	" " "	630*, 639
1 Pet. ii. 5	317, 527	1 Pet. iv. 7	397
1 Pet. ii. 6	233, 252*	1 Pet. iv. 8	108, 351, 372
1 Pet. ii. 7	160, 164, 529, 549*, 551, 571*	1 Pet. iv. 9	397, 611
1 Pet. ii. 8	397, 438	1 Pet. iv. 10	210, 516, 524*
1 Pet. ii. 9	381, 520	1 Pet. iv. 11	108, 158*, 163, 582
1 Pet. ii. 10	343, 476, 485	1 Pet. iv. 12	209*, 405, 501
1 Pet. ii. 11	143, 352	1 Pet. iv. 13	200, 209
1 Pet. ii. 12	108, 342, 352, 384, 387, 411	1 Pet. iv. 14	109, 132, 401, 585
1 Pet. ii. 13	124	1 Pet. iv. 15	440, 446, 502, 518, 519*
1 Pet. ii. 14	379	1 Pet. iv. 17	324, 584, 586
1 Pet. ii. 15	161, 319, 465, 529	1 Pet. iv. 18	174
1 Pet. ii. 16	484, 494, 550, 573*, 612	1 Pet. iv. 19	51, 122, 254, 301, 524
1 Pet. ii. 17	314*, 538	1 Pet. v. 1	140, 200, 334, 384, 528, 529, 537
1 Pet. ii. 19	518, 550	1 Pet. v. 2	314, 385*, 477, 610
1 Pet. ii. 22	167, 616*	1 Pet. v. 3	175
1 Pet. ii. 23	251*, 341, 590*	1 Pet. v. 5	253
1 Pet. ii. 24	149*, 210, 407, 428, 429*	1 Pet. v. 6	261, 407
1 Pet. ii. 25	128, 156	1 Pet. v. 7	351*, 430
1 Pet. iii. 1	75, 154, 282, 351*, 352	1 Pet. v. 8	124, 139, 299, 528, 534, 538
1 Pet. iii. 2	131, 342*	1 Pet. v. 9	123, 215
1 Pet. iii. 3	195, 531	1 Pet. v. 10	58, 134*, 135, 148, 390, 538
1 Pet. iii. 4	386	1 Pet. v. 12	278
1 Pet. iii. 5	134, 154, 233, 268, 341	2 Pet. i. 1	130, 200*, 623
1 Pet. iii. 6	224, 462, 494, 499, 562, 566*	2 Pet. i. 2	286, 545
1 Pet. iii. 7	242, 352, 403, 534	2 Pet. i. 3	109, 381*, 545, 617*
1 Pet. iii. 8	230, 520, 534, 586	2 Pet. i. 4	157, 343, 410, 428, 524, 545, 566*
1 Pet. iii. 9	46, 161	2 Pet. i. 5	142, 313, 443, 545, 566*
1 Pet. iii. 10	197, 326, 604, 614	2 Pet. i. 6	443, 545
1 Pet. iii. 11	143, 429	2 Pet. i. 7	443, 545
1 Pet. iii. 12	125, 409, 586	2 Pet. i. 8	397, 489
1 Pet. iii. 13	437	2 Pet. i. 9	158, 185, 187, 454*, 480*, 553*
1 Pet. iii. 14	146*, 224, 293*, 443	2 Pet. i. 10	128, 256, 290, 313, 506, 527,
1 Pet. iii. 15	209, 227, 534	" " "	549, 551
1 Pet. iii. 17	294, 604*	2 Pet. i. 11	69, 126, 534
1 Pet. iii. 18	215, 373, 383, 412, 433*	2 Pet. i. 12	205, 227, 344
" " "	441, 545	2 Pet. i. 13	408*, 452*
1 Pet. iii. 19	543, 545, 608	2 Pet. i. 14	551
1 Pet. iii. 20	125, 156, 431, 457, 530, 543,	2 Pet. i. 15	89, 256, 321, 340
" " "	131, 545, 621	2 Pet. i. 16	630
1 Pet. iii. 21	189*, 191*, 192, 194*, 528,	2 Pet. i. 17	212, 278*, 351*, 365, 369*
" " "	543, 545, 549, 562	2 Pet. i. 18	352*
1 Pet. iii. 22	543, 545	2 Pet. i. 19	243*, 297, 345, 551

2 Pet. i. 20	161, 196	1 John i. 7	197
2 Pet. i. 21	122, 173, 549	1 John i. 8	253, 537
		1 John i. 9	461*, 537
2 Pet. ii. 1	351*, 443*	1 John i. 10	537, 551
2 Pet. ii. 2	399, 400		
2 Pet. ii. 3	120, 149, 217*, 223*, 386, 422,	1 John ii. 1	537
" " "	466, 579, 639	1 John ii. 2	558, 577*
2 Pet. ii. 4	205, 216, 342*, 448, 478, 545,	1 John ii. 3	161, 545
" " "	566, 569*	1 John ii. 4	483, 537, 610
2 Pet. ii. 5	82, 249*, 342, 344*, 545, 566, 569	1 John ii. 5	40, 185, 543
2 Pet. ii. 6	125, 190, 210*, 340, 531, 545,	1 John ii. 6	537
" " "	566, 569	1 John ii. 7	124, 524*
2 Pet. ii. 7	131, 193, 259, 369*, 545, 566, 569	1 John ii. 8	267, 386, 524
2 Pet. ii. 8	118, 268, 545, 566, 569	1 John ii. 9	537
2 Pet. ii. 9	342, 569*	1 John ii. 10	639
2 Pet. ii. 10	237, 345, 594*	1 John ii. 12	80, 146, 278, 400
2 Pet. ii. 11	243*, 395*	1 John ii. 13	278
2 Pet. ii. 12	159, 397, 440, 628*	1 John ii. 15	185, 537
2 Pet. ii. 13	185*, 416, 430*	1 John ii. 16	529
2 Pet. ii. 14	108, 174, 192, 194*, 201, 238, 525	1 John ii. 17	639
2 Pet. ii. 15	185*, 219	1 John ii. 18	124, 537
2 Pet. ii. 16	95, 388, 538	1 John ii. 19	73, 74, 304*, 317
2 Pet. ii. 18	342*, 529*	1 John ii. 20	371
2 Pet. ii. 19	219*, 273, 344	1 John ii. 21	172*, 278
2 Pet. ii. 20	273, 292, 428, 514, 534	1 John ii. 22	114, 128, 604
2 Pet. ii. 21	239, 282, 320, 334, 482*, 627	1 John ii. 24	128, 574*
2 Pet. ii. 22	109, 352, 588*, 641	1 John ii. 25	225, 530, 628*
		1 John ii. 26	278
2 Pet. iii. 1	58, 142*, 527, 537, 550*	1 John ii. 27	277*, 339, 574*, 610, 612*
2 Pet. iii. 2	190, 191, 205, 318, 529, 550	1 John ii. 2	287, 308, 314
2 Pet. iii. 3	376, 572		
2 Pet. iii. 4	124, 146, 267, 588, 591, 596*,	1 John iii. 1	122, 460*, 537, 615
" " "	612, 632*	1 John iii. 2	122, 209
2 Pet. iii. 5	120, 121, 217*, 351*, 419*,	1 John iii. 4	114, 537
" " "	446, 453*, 467*	1 John iii. 5	267*, 288, 537
2 Pet. iii. 6	604*	1 John iii. 6	537
2 Pet. iii. 7	518	1 John iii. 7	501, 537
2 Pet. iii. 8	395, 502	1 John iii. 8	161, 267, 288, 537
2 Pet. iii. 9	197, 484	1 John iii. 9	537
2 Pet. iii. 10	87, 120, 125, 514	1 John iii. 10	514, 537
2 Pet. iii. 11	342*	1 John iii. 11	161, 338*, 623*
2 Pet. iii. 12	121, 158*, 400*	1 John iii. 12	623*
2 Pet. iii. 13	524*, 527	1 John iii. 13	542
2 Pet. iii. 14	219, 321	1 John iii. 14	273, 457
2 Pet. iii. 15	228	1 John iii. 17	40, 185, 543, 622
2 Pet. iii. 16	110, 143, 405	1 John iii. 18	116, 412, 489, 502*, 537
2 Pet. iii. 17	216, 314, 427, 429	1 John iii. 19	368, 386, 537, 582
		1 John iii. 20	155, 203, 537, 582*
1 John i. 1	124, 272, 567*, 607*, 609, 611	1 John iii. 22	214, 256
1 John i. 2	562, 565	1 John iii. 28	161, 338
1 John i. 3	132, 287, 443, 562, 567*	1 John iii. 24	161, 411, 529, 578
1 John i. 5	161, 199, 499		
1 John i. 6	376, 537, 610	1 John iv. 1	514, 537

1 John iv. 2	346	3 John 7	370*, 383, 638
1 John iv. 4	239, 537, 632*	3 John 8	638
1 John iv. 5	537	3 John 9	51, 141, 278
1 John iv. 6	128, 480, 537, 543	3 John 10	232, 429, 475, 494
1 John iv. 7	537	3 John 12	261*, 271
1 John iv. 8	475, 537	3 John 13	378
1 John iv. 9	133, 161, 218*, 417*, 537	3 John 14	331
1 John iv. 10	161, 527, 537, 555		
1 John iv. 11	292, 448	Jude 1	190, 212, 421*
1 John iv. 12	499, 537	Jude 3	256, 321, 330, 333
1 John iv. 13	161, 199, 366*	Jude 4	130*, 140, 528, 534, 605
1 John iv. 14	527	Jude 5	343, 620*
1 John iv. 15	114, 307	Jude 6	125, 188*, 216, 273
1 John iv. 16	260, 553	Jude 7	230, 594, 623
1 John iv. 17	137, 161, 338, 566	Jude 8	443
1 John iv. 20	274*	Jude 9	209*
1 John iv. 21	371	Jude 11	189, 206
		Jude 13	176
1 John v. 1	178, 537	Jude 14	41, 71, 211, 277*, 370, 384
1 John v. 2	161, 368, 545	Jude 15	163, 222
1 John v. 3	161	Jude 16	116, 572*
1 John v. 4	161, 178	Jude 17	205
1 John v. 5	537	Jude 19	114, 116
1 John v. 6	114, 128, 144, 380*, 498	Jude 20	122, 345
1 John v. 9	271, 537, 619	Jude 21	137, 397
1 John v. 10	225, 474*	Jude 23	85, 370
1 John v. 11	161		
1 John v. 12	475, 537	Rev. i. 1	75, 125
1 John v. 13	134, 278, 288, 549	Rev. i. 2	126
1 John v. 14	161, 256	Rev. i. 3	519
1 John v. 15	295	Rev. i. 4	68, 113, 182*, 536, 587
1 John v. 16	225, 475*, 523*, 530*, 537, 549	Rev. i. 5	197, 532, 536*
1 John v. 17	537	Rev. i. 6	530, 580
1 John v. 18	343, 537	Rev. i. 7	222, 410
1 John v. 19	437, 537	Rev. i. 9	268, 521
1 John v. 20	133*, 157*, 162, 234, 274,	Rev. i. 10	184*
" " "	287, 421*, 528	Rev. i. 13	66, 395*
1 John v. 21	314	Rev. i. 14	247
		Rev. i. 16	525
2 John 1	113, 141, 562	Rev. i. 17	114
2 John 2	411*, 578	Rev. i. 18	65
2 John 4	366, 526	Rev. i. 19	514
2 John 6	146, 161	Rev. i. 20	163, 231*
2 John 7	134*, 140, 142*, 157, 346, 483, 632*		
2 John 8	259	Rev. ii. 2	76, 321, 545
2 John 10	479	Rev. ii. 3	76
2 John 11	200	Rev. ii. 5	155*, 296, 541*, 611
2 John 12	70, 278, 283, 331, 378	Rev. ii. 6	595*
		Rev. ii. 8	87, 276
3 John 2	373*	Rev. ii. 9	321, 545, 551, 582
3 John 4	69, 162, 338, 347, 595*	Rev. ii. 10	366, 589
3 John 5	397	Rev. ii. 11	506
3 John 6	122, 345	Rev. ii. 12	132, 525

Rev. ii. 13	83, 103, 395, 422, 472, 610, 612*	Rev. v. 12	127, 520, 536
Rev. ii. 14	223, 227	Rev. v. 13	108, 347, 374, 409, 526
Rev. ii. 16	155, 214*, 376	Rev. v. 14	74
Rev. ii. 17	198, 579*		
Rev. ii. 18	108, 579	Rev. vi. 1	199
Rev. ii. 19	127, 155, 520	Rev. vi. 2	409
Rev. ii. 20	52, 81, 535*	Rev. vi. 3	199
Rev. ii. 21	331	Rev. vi. 4	148, 583*
Rev. ii. 22	376	Rev. vi. 6	206, 587*
Rev. ii. 23	339	Rev. vi. 8	29, 108, 182, 234, 338, 574
Rev. ii. 24	235, 528	Rev. vi. 9	420
Rev. ii. 25	306	Rev. vi. 10	164, 182
Rev. ii. 26	574	Rev. vi. 11	83, 174, 289, 297
		Rev. vi. 12	523
Rev. iii. 1	155	Rev. vi. 13	74, 523
Rev. iii. 2	89, 155, 334, 514	Rev. vi. 14	366*, 527
Rev. iii. 3	230, 281, 506	Rev. vi. 15	64, 128, 527
Rev. iii. 4	514, 631	Rev. vi. 16	409
Rev. iii. 5	227		
Rev. iii. 7	65	Rev. vii. 1	409, 552
Rev. iii. 8	148, 155	Rev. vii. 2	120, 148, 212, 341*, 602
Rev. iii. 9	87, 289, 337, 526*, 610, 626	Rev. vii. 3	552
Rev. iii. 10	237	Rev. vii. 4	250
Rev. iii. 12	58 112, 148, 506, 507*, 524,	Rev. vii. 9	148, 520, 526, 527, 535*, 579
" " "	536*, 574, 603	Rev. vii. 11	73, 78, 125, 210
Rev. iii. 14	524	Rev. vii. 12	128, 520, 610
Rev. iii. 15	155, 302	Rev. vii. 14	383, 399
Rev. iii. 16	334	Rev. vii. 16	77, 506
Rev. iii. 17	114, 117, 271	Rev. vii. 17	191, 550
Rev. iii. 18	226, 577		
Rev. iii. 19	470*	Rev. viii. 3	79, 212, 289, 514
Rev. iii. 21	384, 574	Rev. viii. 4	216*
		Rev. viii. 5	201, 272*, 520
Rev. iv. 1	79, 595	Rev. viii. 7	519, 527, 609
Rev. iv. 3	68, 215, 221	Rev. viii. 8	515
Rev. iv. 4	227, 250, 535	Rev. viii. 9	515, 536, 592
Rev. iv. 5	114, 166		
Rev. iv. 7	108	Rev. viii. 11	108, 182, 184, 362, 367, 515
Rev. iv. 8	345, 398, 526, 536	Rev. viii. 12	460*, 609
Rev. iv. 9	280*, 309	Rev. viii. 13	117, 368
Rev. iv. 10	210		
Rev. iv. 11	108	Rev. ix. 1	343, 606
		Rev. ix. 2	606
Rev. v. 1	408, 409, 525	Rev. ix. 3	396
Rev. v. 2	226, 585	Rev. ix. 4	171, 474, 633
Rev. v. 3	491*	Rev. ix. 6	75, 86, 223, 506
Rev. v. 4	227, 491*	Rev. ix. 7	604*
Rev. v. 6	65, 114, 166, 526, 536	Rev. ix. 10	324, 623*
Rev. v. 7	272*	Rev. ix. 11	534, 591
Rev. v. 8	74, 114, 166, 516	Rev. ix. 12	179, 248
Rev. v. 9	390, 589	Rev. ix. 13	65
Rev. v. 10	206	Rev. ix. 14	392, 536
Rev. v. 11	535*	Rev. ix. 17	518

Rev. ix. 18	83, 362, 364*, 367, 371, 429, 515	Rev. xiii. 7	409, 527
Rev. ix. 19	623	Rev. xiii. 8	148
Rev. ix. 20	83, 210, 289, 366, 460*, 622	Rev. xiii. 10	62, 83, 128, 388
Rev. ix. 21	148, 491, 606	Rev. xiii. 11	65, 623*
Rev. x. 1	525	Rev. xiii. 12	149
Rev. x. 2	352*, 376, 552	Rev. xiii. 13	461*
Rev. x. 3	612	Rev. xiii. 14	62, 66
Rev. x. 4	70, 612	Rev. xiii. 15	307, 480
Rev. x. 5	396	Rev. xiii. 16	79, 128, 289, 409, 420, 529
Rev. x. 6	222	Rev. xiii. 17	127, 290, 536, 594
Rev. x. 7	71, 277*	Rev. xiv. 1	43, 79, 536
Rev. x. 9	155, 316*	Rev. xiv. 2	606
Rev. x. 10	198	Rev. xiv. 3	70, 250
Rev. x. 11	393	Rev. xiv. 4	472, 527
Rev. xi. 1	536	Rev. xiv. 5	538, 616
Rev. xi. 2	43, 250	Rev. xiv. 6	88, 409
Rev. xi. 3	436	Rev. xiv. 7	126, 536, 552
Rev. xi. 4	536*	Rev. xiv. 8	191, 609
Rev. xi. 5	294, 541*	Rev. xiv. 9	410
Rev. xi. 6	375, 396	Rev. xiv. 10	87, 91, 191*
Rev. xi. 7	152	Rev. xiv. 11	210, 631
Rev. xi. 9	267, 589	Rev. xiv. 12	186, 536*
Rev. xi. 10	232, 281, 409	Rev. xiv. 13	197, 234, 289, 317*, 341*,
Rev. xi. 11	413	" " "	390, 460*
Rev. xi. 13	63, 514	Rev. xiv. 14	535*, 579
Rev. xi. 14	179, 248	Rev. xiv. 15	212, 324, 388
Rev. xi. 15	526, 535	Rev. xiv. 17	133
Rev. xi. 17	533	Rev. xiv. 18	155, 212
Rev. xi. 18	514	Rev. xiv. 19	526, 536
Rev. xi. 19	72	Rev. xiv. 20	372, 557
Rev. xii. 1	528	Rev. xv. 1	341
Rev. xii. 2	267	Rev. xv. 2	247*, 353, 367*
Rev. xii. 3	525	Rev. xv. 4	214, 508, 549, 585
Rev. xii. 4	281, 334	Rev. xv. 5	72, 83
Rev. xii. 5	83	Rev. xv. 6	106, 432, 525
Rev. xii. 6	148	Rev. xv. 8	201
Rev. xii. 7	214, 827*, 519	Rev. xvi. 1	607
Rev. xii. 8	491, 616	Rev. xvi. 2	528, 524, 607
Rev. xii. 9	529, 602	Rev. xvi. 3	530, 536
Rev. xii. 11	399	Rev. xvi. 6	538
Rev. xii. 13	66	Rev. xvi. 7	207*, 533
Rev. xii. 14	88, 148, 177*, 249, 370	Rev. xvi. 9	225, 229, 318
Rev. xii. 16	72	Rev. xvi. 10	350
Rev. xii. 17	232, 393	Rev. xvi. 11	622
Rev. xiii. 1	65, 374, 410	Rev. xvi. 12	120, 133
Rev. xiii. 2	152	Rev. xvi. 14	514
Rev. xiii. 3	237*	Rev. xvi. 15	558, 585
Rev. xiii. 4	210, 214, 584	Rev. xvi. 18	606
Rev. xiii. 6	222, 405	Rev. xvi. 19	191, 611
		Rev. xvi. 20	616

Rev. xvi. 21	281, 368	Rev. xix. 16	246*
		Rev. xix. 21	83, 201, 514
Rev. xvii. 2	149, 201		
Rev. xvii. 3	201	Rev. xx. 1	65, 116, 408
Rev. xvii. 4	94, 226	Rev. xx. 2	536
Rev. xvii. 6	201, 224	Rev. xx. 3	536
Rev. xvii. 8	208, 626, 628	Rev. xx. 4	106
Rev. xvii. 9	149	Rev. xx. 5	297*
Rev. xvii. 12	65, 515	Rev. xx. 7	514
Rev. xvii. 13	78	Rev. xx. 8	149
Rev. xvii. 14	536	Rev. xx. 10	353
Rev. xvii. 15	520	Rev. xx. 11	525, 616
Rev. xvii. 16	89, 141*, 388	Rev. xx. 12	72, 368
Rev. xvii. 18	114	Rev. xx. 13	133, 516
		Rev. xx. 14	114
Rev. xviii. 2	609	Rev. xx. 15	477, 478
Rev. xviii. 3	190, 514		
Rev. xviii. 4	449, 515	Rev. xxi. 1	244, 523, 527
Rev. xviii. 5	155, 205, 247	Rev. xxi. 2	211, 524
Rev. xviii. 6	163	Rev. xxi. 4	500*
Rev. xviii. 7	506	Rev. xxi. 5	228
Rev. xviii. 8	29, 87	Rev. xxi. 6	76, 148, 190, 552
Rev. xviii. 9	87, 222, 410	Rev. xxi. 8	343*, 520
Rev. xviii. 10	603	Rev. xxi. 9	132
Rev. xviii. 11	222, 393, 408, 499	Rev. xxi. 11	247*, 536*
Rev. xviii. 12	234, 520, 536, 579*, 591, 592	Rev. xxi. 12	536*, 514
Rev. xviii. 13	579*	Rev. xxi. 13	41, 60, 121
Rev. xviii. 14	75, 86, 156, 370, 427, 499,	Rev. xxi. 16	408*
" " "	506, 507	Rev. xxi. 17	43, 65, 231*, 250, 534*
Rev. xviii. 16	591	Rev. xxi. 21	249
Rev. xviii. 17	223	Rev. xxi. 23	552
Rev. xviii. 20	183*, 232, 408	Rev. xxi. 25	506, 507, 562
Rev. xviii. 21	506, 616	Rev. xxi. 27	171, 506, 633*
Rev. xviii. 22	172, 506, 603		
Rev. xviii. 23	114, 506	Rev. xxii. 1	128
Rev. xviii. 24	177*	Rev. xxii. 2	66
		Rev. xxii. 3	172
Rev. xix. 1	526	Rev. xxii. 5	120
Rev. xix. 3	76	Rev. xxii. 8	521
Rev. xix. 4	250	Rev. xxii. 9	598, 601
Rev. xix. 5	209, 536	Rev. xxii. 10	538
Rev. xix. 6	536	Rev. xxii. 11	311*
Rev. xix. 8	545	Rev. xxii. 12	318
Rev. xix. 10	114, 582, 598, 601	Rev. xxii. 13	552
Rev. xix. 11	72	Rev. xxii. 14	289
Rev. xix. 12	536	Rev. xxii. 15	585
Rev. xix. 13	108, 182	Rev. xxii. 16	393
Rev. xix. 14	133, 392, 525*	Rev. xxii. 18	638
Rev. xix. 15	141, 191*	Rev. xxii. 19	82, 594

ONE AUG 10 1940

DEC 31 1978

21st Feb. 17, 17.

